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ABSTRACT

The study focuses on student-athletes’ perceptions of the D-III institutions’ achievements in equity between genders in their athletic programs as mandated by Title IX. The study was conducted at the ten institutions in the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference (AMCC) providing a final useable data set of 450 student-athletes. Thirteen criteria of equity were assessed (Good Sports Inc. & Title IX and Gender Equity Specialists, 2003). The student-athletes served as a guide to the perceptions of equity at their institution, while the athletic directors provided information concerning the institutional perspectives. The study revealed that male and female student-athletes perceived equity in eight of thirteen programmatic areas. There were five of thirteen areas in which male and female student-athletes perceived that men were treated better than women. The second part of the study investigated whether gender and various college characteristics affected the perception of gender equity among student athletes. The study concluded that gender, GPA, and type of institution (public vs. private) were significant independent variables in the model. The study concludes with recommendations for athletic directors and institutions for improving both the perception and the reality of gender equity among student athletes.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Background

In 1972 Congress passed Title IX of the Educational Amendments to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title IX (as it is commonly referred to) states:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. ("Title IX of the Educational Amendments," 1972)

This was the first comprehensive federal law prohibiting sex discrimination against students and employees of educational institutions, including all aspects of public schooling, recruitment, employment, financial assistance, health, housing, insurance benefits and athletics. It is in the area of sex discrimination in athletics where there has been the greatest controversy, and that is the focus of the current research study.

Prior to Title IX, the participation of women and girls in athletics was strictly limited. This reflected both historical precedent in athletic opportunities and traditional beliefs concerning the unsuitability of vigorous sport activities for females. With the passage of Title IX, schools at all levels were required to provide comparable athletic (as well as academic) opportunities for males and females or risk fines and the withdrawal of federal funding.
Since the passage of Title IX, the participation of girls in high school sports has increased nearly tenfold and nearly doubled at the college/university level (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002). However, at least in some instances, Title IX has been associated with curtailment of opportunities available for men and boys as budgets are stretched to accommodate additional programming requirements for women and girls. While some have argued that these shifts represent long overdue realignments of resources and that most schools do not curtail male programs, others argue that the act has resulted in discrimination against males for whom long-standing cultural norms and personal interests are more likely to focus on athletic skills and participations.

However, regardless of one’s views on the overall fairness of Title IX, it cannot be denied that since its passage, women’s sports participation has increased markedly. At the same time, it seems likely that full equity has not been achieved in all settings and that compliance with the goals of Title IX has not been complete. Moreover, judging equity is not a simple matter. Although Federal regulations have established criteria to ascertain compliance, the extent to which full equity is perceived or experienced by the public and by the members of the educational institutions likely varies among individuals.

**Purpose of the Study**

Gender equity and Title IX have been the focus of much debate in the press and in the locker rooms of America. A significant body of literature exists concerning institutional compliance and gender equity issues. Position papers have been written, court cases decided, and even manuals for institutions on how to achieve gender equity
and Title IX compliance have been prepared (Anderson & Cheslock, 2004; NCAA Gender Equity Report, 2007; Hooks, 1998; "Policy Interpretation: Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics," 1979). There are opinion pieces and much data about what college coaches think of Title IX and gender equity (Hull, 1993; Mill, 1981; Wade-Gravett, 1996). Administrators, in the position of Senior Women’s Administrators (SWAs) were studied specifically (Calkins, 2000). Athletic Directors (ADs) were surveyed about compliance in D3 institutions (Hooks, 1998), compliance strategies (Hattig, 1994; Sjogren, 1998), and their perceptions (Campbell, 1987; Crow, 1994; Hull, 1993; Mill, 1981; Wade-Gravett, 1996). Interestingly, Wade-Gravett (1996) included college presidents in her study, concluding that perceptions between groups were different and knowledge of compliance should be a priority of everyone involved. Even the public has been polled and has entered into the debate (Hogshead-Makar, 2003; Suggs, 2005). However, there is a glaring lack of information on how student athletes perceive their school’s compliance with gender equity prescriptions.

The extent to which students view their institutions as providing equitable athletic access, facilities, and services for males and females was explored in the current study by focusing on student athletes in a single Division III athletic conference, the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference (AMCC) with schools located in Pennsylvania and New York.

The AMCC is a young conference, where many of the institutions have initiated intercollegiate athletics years after the inception of Title IX. So, most of these institutions only know a world with Title IX. Every step of their development as an
athletic department has taken Title IX compliance measures into account. In addition, only one of the conference schools has intercollegiate football. Title IX compliance literature shows that smaller institutions are more likely than larger institutions to be in compliance (Sigelman & Wahlbeck, 1999). Further, due to the large size of the football team and no comparable sister sport, schools without football are more likely to be in compliance than those with football (Sigelman & Wahlbeck, 1999). In this conference the athletic directors and school presidents pride themselves on focusing on individual student growth and development. Putting the needs of the students first is an integral part of the mission of all of these institutions and a major premise for Title IX in Division III. There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that each of the institutions has been proactive in the quest for gender equity in the establishment of their athletic programs.

Although the public face of the conference and the individual institutions support Title IX compliance, there is a question concerning the student perceptions of their institutional compliance. On one hand, the institutions are small enough that the student-athlete might recognize the efforts being made by the institution towards compliance. On the other hand, there may be other reasons that students perceive a lack of equity. It may be due to under-staffing of athletic departments, such that there might not be enough resources available to educate student-athletes about their schools’ compliance. However, it may be that there are different conceptions of equity between male and female student-athletes.

Moreover, even within the group of student athletes at these schools, there may be differences in the extent to which individuals perceive their institutions as providing
equitable athletic facilities and services to their male and female athletes. This study explores the bases of such differences by addressing the following general research questions:

1. Do male and female athletes perceive gender equity in their school’s athletic programs differently?
2. Do type of institution and college experiences influence male and female student athlete perceptions of gender equity?

**Importance of the Study**

Title IX affects more than the athletes on the athletic playing surfaces of America. It influences institutional missions, budgets, admissions applications, publicity, and hiring practices. The responsibility of compliance falls on each individual institution; each needs a plan to achieve Title IX compliance. This study provided a framework through which institutions evaluate a component of compliance that has been previously ignored.

The findings from this study should contribute to a better understanding of compliance and gender equity from the athletes’ perspective. In doing so, it may add a component for any comprehensive institutional action plan for improving gender equity.
Definition of Terms

There are a number of terms that are common place in the world of intercollegiate athletics and the Title IX literature. To help the reader who may not be involved in these worlds on an everyday basis, this set of definitions is included below.

- NCAA = National Collegiate Athletic Association
- NAIA = National Association Intercollegiate Athletics
- AMCC = Refers to the Division III athletic conference, Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, used in this study.
- OCR = Refers to the Office of Civil Rights within the Department of Education
- EADA = Refers to the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act, which requires institutions of higher education who participate in intercollegiate athletics and receives federal funding to disclose information (for public record) concerning compliance annually.

Summary

Title IX remains a very complicated policy for institutions and individuals to understand and ultimately incorporate into their operations. While some research has been conducted on the perceptions of coaches and administrators, very little work has been conducted on the perceptions of the student athlete. At the beginning of the study, the perceptions of the researcher were that the AMCC was a conference that was making
a good faith effort to implement Title IX and was successful in doing so. The question became, if the institutions were doing everything possible, what were the perceptions of the student athletes? If the students do perceive equity, then the perceptions become reality and we can presume equitable treatment. If the students perceive inequity, then even though the institutions were providing equitable treatment, there is still a problem that deserves attention.

The study will evaluate the perceptions of equity by student athletes in the AMCC athletic conference. Further, the researcher will identify whether significant institutional or college experience variables affect the perception of gender equity and conclude with not only implications for practice but advice for athletic departments and directors.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter summarizes literature in the following areas as background for the current study: 1) the changing place of women in sports; 2) the context and content of the passage Title IX legislation mandating gender equity; 3) evolving interpretations and refinements of Title IX; 4) previous empirical research directed to assessing compliance and perceptions of compliance among various stakeholders; and 5) theoretical perspectives on student perceptions for framing the analysis to follow. Based on the literature review, a conceptual framework was developed to guide the research.

Women in Sports: Historical Perspective

On a Saturday night in February 2004 in Raleigh, North Carolina, the “Mecca” of college basketball, at Cameron Indoor Stadium, a sell-out crowd of 9,314 people watched a women’s basketball game. Number one in the country Duke University played number two, the University of Connecticut. The Cameron Crazies, the fanatic student supporters of Duke basketball, were in rare form taunting U-Conn’s coach and cheering on their team. Before the game, Duke officials were forced to deny admission to thousands of fans who wanted to watch the contest (Droschak, 2004).
February 15th and 19th of 2004 were also impressive days in Penn State athletic history. On the 15th, the Penn State Women’s basketball team played Michigan State University in front of a sold out Bryce Jordan Center, which seats over 15,000. The sell-out was the largest crowd for a women’s basketball game in the Big-10 during that year, and the sixth largest crowd ever at the Bryce Jordan Center. Four days later, on the 29th of February, the game versus Purdue University sold out as well. These national and regional stories helped to illustrate the status of women’s athletics in recent years.

History has not always been as glamorous for women’s athletics. There were times in the past, when women simply fought for an opportunity to play and compete. During the Colonial Period, women were moderately active in community sports and games (Struna, 2002), but not to the extent of men. As the country expanded, women would participate in tavern games and hunting. In addition, women were very active in dancing, either dancing for recreation or attending balls. Races in walking, running, and equestrian were often performed by women (Struna, 2002).

In the 19th century, there was a dramatic shift in the ideals with women in sports. Enlightenment ideology helped shape the new role of women as frail. Women needed to stay healthy in order to bear children and could not get hurt playing sports. In 1837, the popular book, *Exercise for Ladies*, was published by Donald Walker. Walker’s book (1837) warned women of the dangers of horseback riding, because he thought it would deform the lower part of the body of females. In the early 1900s, physical education instructors strongly opposed competition among women, fearing it would make them less feminine (Struna, 1996). In the 1890s, a variation of Naismith’s game of basketball was
developed for women (The Women's Sports Foundation, 2003). With the idea that women were not capable of enduring the physical tasks associated with the game, a modified game for women was developed in which the court was divided into areas or zones and individual players were restricted to a specific zone for play.

In his book, Robert Simon begins his sex equality in sports chapter with an excerpt from Frederick Rodgers’ 1929 book, *School and Society*, to help illustrate the mindset of the times. Rodgers states “Games and recreation for all types of girls, by all means, which develop charm and social health,” “…were appropriate…” but athletic competition in basketball, track and field sports, and baseball”…were not (Simon, 1991).

Not only were the rules of the games different for women, but the nature of sports competitions themselves differed for men and women. In the 1920s secondary and college sports for women were not played in contests between schools, but as part of campus sports days. The school’s women participants would travel to another school location, but the participants were mixed so that all the students from one institution would not be on the same team (Struna, 2002). The idea was that if students from opposing schools would play on the same team and against one another, then the level of play would not be as competitive or as physically demanding as that of men.

With the emergence of the women’s rights movement that began in Seneca Falls in 1848, there was a change of ideology. In 1865, Matthew Vassar’s vision of training elite women was realized with the opening of Vassar College. There was a special School of Physical Training with classes in riding, gardening, swimming, boating, skating and “other physical accomplishments suitable for ladies to acquire…bodily
strength and grace (Struna, 2002).” Outside of colleges, women participated in an increasing number of sports, contradicting the myth created by the male dominated medical profession that physical movements were destructive to femininity and reproductive functions (Struna, 2002). Women continued to participate in more and more sports. According to Susan B. Anthony, it was the invention of the bicycle that did more than any single item in emancipating women (The Women's Sports Foundation, 2003). The bicycle, and then the automobile, emancipated women and gave them the freedom to get away from the activities that tied them to the home.

Times of momentous leaps forward and times of little baby steps have occurred throughout the entire history of women’s athletics. A major change occurred at one of the most prestigious institutions at the beginning of the 20th century, when not too much was changing for women’s athletics. Two of the prominent figures in American higher education were also linked to the growth of women in sport in America. William Raeney Harper, the first president at the University of Chicago, who was noted for promoting the German model of higher education within American Higher Education system (Veysey, 1965), and Amos Alonzo Stagg, one of the most influential people in the development of college athletics, specifically college football (Geiger, 1999), were instrumental in shaping the direction of college athletics for women. These two legendary figures hired Gertrude Dudley in 1898, as Director of Women’s Athletics. Dudley was integral in promoting competition for women’s athletics. She continued with the notion of school days by inviting local colleges to the Women’s Athletic Association “Play Days on the
Midway.” The teams would come in, be mixed so no school could be declared the winner, and simply compete (Leovy, 1998).

The women’s roles in the Olympics evolved as well. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) began to officially sanction women’s competitions in tennis, archery, figure skating, swimming, and diving at the 1908 and 1912 Olympics (Dyreson, 1998). However, the United States was unable to field women’s teams during this time, because according to Dyreson, the US Olympic Committee did not permit women to compete in the United States until 1920.

Women continued their methodical progress in athletics and in 1928 the Summer Olympic Games opened with gymnastics and five track and field events for women. However, there were restrictions on the types of clothes women could wear, specifically the clothes should not be form fitting and should not be revealing.

When women flooded the workforce during World War II, women flooded the playing fields as well. With many men overseas, the American public turned to women’s sports. There were indeed professional women’s baseball leagues, as portrayed in the movie, *A League of Their Own*. Leagues formed for golf and tennis, while track and field events began to blossom for women. These times laid the foundation for what Struna called the “sixties boom.” Billy Jean King began to challenge traditional Wimbledon, by demanding equal pay for women’s events (Struna, 2002). In 1973, she went as far as to challenge Bobby Riggs in the battle of the sexes, proving that women could compete with men.
Title IX Context and Content: 1972-1984

The 1970s was a time of change and according to Hendrickson and Gibbs (1986) it was a time of federal regulations for higher education. The Buckley Amendment of 1974 defined the rights of parents and students and their access to student’s records. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 set guidelines prohibiting discrimination in the admission or hiring of handicapped individuals (Hendrickson & Gibbs, 1986). The passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 significantly changed institutional admissions’ policies, and its passage generated the greatest change in women’s athletics. The law states:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. ("Title IX of the Educational Amendments," 1972)

While there is no specific mention of athletics, Title IX addressed gender inequities in education providing equal opportunities for women in all areas. According to a national study at the University of Iowa (Curtis & Grant, 2000), 9% of the medical and 7% of the law degrees in 1972 were received by women. In 1994, women received 38% of the medical degrees, and 43% of the law degrees. Curtis and Grant (2000) further stated that in 1977 women received 25% of doctoral degrees versus 44% in 1994. Since 1972 the enforcement of Title IX resulted in an evolving concept of gender equity.
Objections to Title IX have existed since its implementation. In 1974, Senator Tower introduced an amendment, that did not pass, that would have exempted revenue-producing sports from being part of the calculation of a school’s Title IX compliance (Hendrickson, 1999). In 1975, a similar bill was proposed, which again did not pass, that would have allowed revenue-producing sports to pay for the cost of their own sport first, then the cost of the other sports (Hendrickson, 1999). In 1977, Towers and others again proposed a bill to exclude revenue-producing sports from the Title IX equation. However, both of these bills (1975 and 1977) died before there were any congressional votes. There were a number of post enactment hearings to define the scope of the law. According to Hendrickson (1999), a possible explanation for this was the fact that when Title IX was presented as an amendment to the Education Amendments on the floor of Congress, there had been no prior Congressional hearings on the law (Hendrickson, 1999). According to Hunt, the early 1970s could be considered the “second women’s movement.” Hunt stated there was a three-pronged approach to “exploit the full range of political tactics (Hunt, 1999).” The lawsuits put the initial pressure on the federal courts to apply gender classification under equal protection analysis. There was a major political campaign to approve the Equal Rights Amendment, and a constitutional measure implemented to prohibit the use of gender classification. The combination of these three prongs produced the basis for a “single, coherent theory of women’s equality (Hunt, 1999).”

Elementary schools had until July of 1976 to be in compliance with Title IX, while high schools and institutions of higher education had an additional two years to
move towards compliance (NAGWS, 2000). In a longitudinal study by Acosta and Carpenter (2002), the twenty-five year update found that in 1972 there was an average of two women’s teams at institutions of higher education. When schools were expected to be moving towards compliance in 1976, there was an average of 5.61 women’s teams per institution, an increase of 3.61 teams in the first four years. In 2002, the average number of women’s teams was at its highest with 8.34 women’s teams per institution, which is less than a 3 team increase since 1976.

In 1979, the Department of Health Education and Welfare (HEW) developed a policy for Title IX compliance ("Policy Interpretation: Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics," 1979). The policy established a way to assess institutional compliance with Title IX. The interpretations are divided into three premises. The first premise requires that athletic scholarships, or financial assistance based on athletic ability be awarded fairly. The financial aid for males and females should be proportional to the number of participating male and female athletes. The second premise required compliance in all other athletic programs areas. This means that there should be equivalent treatment in benefits and opportunities for males and females. The third premise required compliance and equivalent treatment in meeting the needs and serving the abilities of both male and female students. This would later evolve into the three prong test for compliance.

In 1980 the Department of Education was established to ensure access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation. Within the Department of Education, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) would oversee Title IX
compliance. The mission of the OCR was to vigorously enforce civil rights ("Policy Interpretation: Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics," 1979).

**Title IX Refinements and Re-Interpretation: 1984-Present**

A setback in the history of Title IX occurred in 1984. The Grove City vs. Bell case almost changed the entire landscape of American Higher Education with the definition or interpretation of one word. The Grove City Case determined that only institutions receiving direct federal financial aid must comply with Title IX legislation. While the end result is the same, the actual outcome of the case stated that only programs within the institution that received federal funding had to comply with Title IX ("Grove City College v. Bell," 1984). Athletic departments rarely received federal financial aid and at Grove City College only the financial aid office receiving student financial aid, and hence not the whole institution. Therefore, only the financial aid office was mandated to meet compliance requirements.

OCR cases were put on hold, institutions changed their athletic mission, and an entire cohort of college females had no recourse for inequities based on gender at their institution (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002). However, in March of 1988, despite a veto by President Reagan, the Civil Rights Restoration Act (1988) became law, negating the Grove City decision. Under the new law, the word “program” was redefined to mean the entire institution. If the financial aid office was receiving federal funds, then the entire
institution must comply with Title IX, and college athletics came under the jurisdiction of Title IX.

Carpenter and Acosta (2002) cite Franklin vs. Gwinnett County Public schools ("Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools," 1992) as the most important case for Title IX in the first twenty years. Before 1992, institutions were held to empty threats regarding compliance with Title IX. No institution had lost funding or had any sanctions placed on it due to non-compliance. Franklin vs. Gwinnett allowed for complainants to seek punitive damages when there had been an intentional action not to comply with Title IX. With the addition of punitive damages, complainants were able to attract qualified legal counsel to represent them in Title IX cases. After 1992, the number of court cases increased, enhancing the validity of the three prong test for compliance (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002, p. 133).

The Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) passed by Congress late in 1993 required institutions receiving federal funding and participating in intercollegiate athletics to disclose numbers in reference to compliance ("Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA)," 1994). Each institution would be required to report annually, the first report due in 1996.

In January of 1996, the OCR developed the three prong test, which was a further explanation of the 1979 policy interpretation. Compliance could be achieved through the three prongs: substantial proportionality, a history of program expansion, or by demonstrating the institution was meeting the needs of its students. The interpretation of the policy states that if any of the three prongs are met, then the institution is in
compliance. The first prong, or first area of compliance, is substantial proportionality. Compliance could be achieved by establishing substantially equal male and female opportunities for athletes based on the proportion of male and female students enrolled at the institution. The institution’s athletic participation gender ratio must be consistent, or substantially proportionate, with the institution’s overall gender ratio. For example, in the infamous Cohen et al v. Brown University case ("Cohen v. Brown University," 1996), Brown University was not in compliance when women accounted for 48% of the student body, but only 37% of the varsity athletes. According to Alden and Associates, a nationally based consulting firm designed to assist institutions of higher education with issues such as Title IX, the president Dr. Betsy Alden said that a differential of plus or minus five percentage points is thought of as the maximum acceptable range for substantial proportionality (Alden, 2002). While substantial proportionality is the most concrete, dealing with straight percentages, it is the hardest to achieve in terms of compliance.

The second prong for compliance is a history and continuing practice of program expansion. This prong is vague and the easiest with which to comply. If the institution can show they are actively adding women’s teams or opportunities, then they are in compliance. An official policy for adding women’s teams or opportunities is enough to meet the requirements of the second prong. According to Alden (2002), the established timeline is ten years. If an institution was inactive in adding women’s teams and/or roster spots for ten years, then they would be considered not in compliance. Alden states the OCR does not want to see women’s programs cut. Again, there needs to be a plan. If
athletics programs are to be cut, there needs to be a clear justification for why the programs are being cut, and the OCR wants to see fewer cuts in women’s programs than men’s programs. And finally, Alden states that a promise is not enough, the institution must have an established or approved policy for improving opportunities for the underrepresented sex (Alden, 2002). In the Cohen et al v. Brown University case, it would have been possible to develop a plan, but not have the plan accepted. Brown University was not in compliance with the second prong either. Brown developed a plan in July of 1995 that included capping rosters on men’s teams by eliminating 44 positions. In addition, they would add 5 women’s junior varsity teams (basketball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, and tennis) and increase opportunities for women on existing teams. The proposal would increase the proportion of women to 49% of the athletic student body. Plaintiffs’ lawyers argued, and the court agreed, that the opportunities created in junior varsity sports could not be compared to varsity sport’s experiences. In August of the same year, Brown’s plan was rejected and they were still not in compliance ("Cohen v. Brown University," 1996).

The third prong, or area of compliance, was for the institution to demonstrate that the interests and abilities of their entire student population are being met. The institution was required to accommodate athletic interests and abilities of one sex to the same degree as they accommodate interests and abilities of the other sex. Typically, a needs assessment is conducted to prove or determine the interest and abilities of students at the institution. If an institution could demonstrate that the interests and abilities of their students were being met, then the institution was in compliance. For example, it was not
practical for an inner city school to add competition horseback riding. However, at the same school, if they were not in compliance and there was an interest in women’s volleyball, the institution must add women’s volleyball. In the Brown case, Brown University conducted their needs assessment of students and determined that the interest and abilities of their students were being met. However, the Federal Court of Appeals First Circuit refuted the study and dismissed the evidence Brown provided. The court stated that Brown University only studied their own students and did not survey the students in the applicant pool for admissions ("Cohen v. Brown University," 1996). The rationale for this ruling was that students interested in sports not offered at Brown had already self-selected to matriculate at other institutions.

In 1998, the OCR responded to a request from Bowling Green University seeking clarification on financial aid issues and Title IX. The response, which would be known as the 1998 Clarification Letter (Guidance on Financial Aid), stated that financial aid was to be substantially proportionate to the student athlete population. Unlike the 1996 letter on proportionality, which was based on the student population, the awards to student athletes had to be based on the proportion of male and female student athletes. For example, if females made up 48% of the student athlete population, then 48% of the monies awarded would need to go to female student athletes. The letter did provide some flexibility in allowing a difference of 1%, so in the example, women could receive between 47-49%.
Despite great reservations on the continuation of Title IX during the Bush Administration, the OCR issued another letter of clarification in 2003. The letter, or Further Letter of Clarification of 2003, listed five points (United States, 2003).

1. The OCR will continue to implement the three prong test to determine compliance.

2. The practice of cutting or reducing men’s teams is not held in favor by the OCR.

3. The OCR will work with institutions, if they so desire, to help them achieve compliance.

4. Private donations made to teams or institutions are still held accountable to Title IX implications.

5. The OCR will work to maintain consistency in enforcing compliance issues across the country.

In March of 2005, the OCR issued another letter of clarification entitled; Additional Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletic Policy: Three-Part Test – Part Three. The letter gave institutions a framework to assess the interest and abilities of the student population, which would allow institutions to comply with the third part or prong of the 1996 three prong approach (NCAA Gender Equity Report, 2007). The letter also stated that students, who did not answer the survey, would be presumed to have no interest. This letter received great criticism by Title IX activist and President of the NCAA, Miles Brand. The new policy is basically a reversal of the Brown v. Cohen decision, which mandated the burden of proof was on the institution to prove that interest and abilities did not exist.
The clarification letter allows for a flawed survey technique to determine interest and abilities, which places the burden of proof back onto the students. The NCAA issued a response requesting that institutions follow the intent of the 2003 clarification. In addition, the NCAA issued a list of important factors when assessing interest and abilities (*NCAA Gender Equity Report, 2007*).

The reason that the letters of clarification were necessary was the ongoing challenge to the three prong test and Title IX compliance.

**Research on Compliance and Gender Equity**

Research on gender equity and Title IX compliance have been viewed from varying perspectives, including the institution level, the administrative level, and the athlete or participant level.

**Compliance at the Institution Level**

Anderson, Cheslock, and Ehrenberg (2006) looked at all of the institutions reporting in the Equity in Athletics Disclosure document as defined in the law (*"Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act [EADA],"* 1994). They evaluated the determinants of compliance and non-compliance. They found that there were three major institutional characteristics that contributed to compliance. One characteristic was the type of institution, public vs. private. They found that private institutions are significantly less likely to be in compliance as measured by the proportionality gap (the difference in the
The proportion of female student population and the female athlete population. They hypothesized that there could be a difference in how private institutions might use athletics to increase male enrollment ("Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA)," 1994, p. 241).

The second characteristic identified by Anderson et al. ("Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act [EADA]," 1994) is the size of the female undergraduate population. The larger the female undergraduate population, the higher the proportionality gap and the more likely the institution would not be in compliance.

Finally, for the third characteristic Anderson, Cheslock, and Ehrenberg (2006) noted that regional differences were evident. The proportionality gap was larger in the Midwest and Southern institutions. Stafford (2004) also found regional differences in that institutions in the South were less likely to be in compliance.

Sigelman and Wahlbeck (1999) analyzed the data on over 300 Division I (D I) athletics programs with the intent of identifying the actions for each school in order to reach compliance. They found that most Division I schools are not even close to compliance and added that this is especially true of those with football teams. They found that compliance is more achievable for schools with smaller proportion of female students, more resources for female athletics, a smaller athletic program and those without football. They also discussed a reallocation strategy that would be attractive to those institutions that were not in compliance. The researchers obtained their data from one main source, The Chronicle of Higher Education (Naughton, 1997), which reported the individual institutional results for the NCAA survey. Additionally, the Women’s
Sports Federation also reported the data from the NCAA survey (Anderson & Cheslock, 2004). Although the initial survey was only reported at an aggregate level, in both cases, the Chronicle and the Women’s Sports Federation contacted each institution for missing information. Thus, the Sigelman and Wahlbeck study (1999) was data-driven and mathematically-based, focusing on proportionality statistics and strategies for institutional improvement.

Agthe and Billings (2000) focused on how the financial status of an institution’s football team affected the institution’s ability to comply with Title IX. They developed and tested a conceptual model to measure the influence of football profits on meeting Title IX requirements in both participation and athletic aid. While they also used a number of other factors such as other men’s sports, endowment, and the existence of state funding, they found that there was no significant impact of the gap between football’s revenues and expenses on the participation gap.

Finally, Stafford (2004) used the same data as Sigelman and Wahlbeck (1999), (the NCAA study supplemented by additional data gathering from the institutions). In her study, she found that institutions with football and those in the South are less likely to be in compliance. Further, large institutions and those with a lower percentage of female undergraduates are more likely to be in compliance. It is noteworthy that these data were not survey data and the study by Stafford only involved Division I programs.
Compliance from the Perspective of Administration

Gender equity compliance has also been studied from the perspective of athletic directors, senior women’s administrators, college presidents, and coaches. Some of the relevant studies and the findings are given in the pages that follow.

For example, in the Calkin’s study (2000), the researcher limited her surveys to each Senior Woman’s Administrator (SWA) at each institution. The SWA is the highest ranking woman within the administration of the athletic department, when a woman does not hold the position of athletic director. The survey was sent to 305 Division I institution in the country with about a 50% response rate (Calkins, 2000). The survey data on participation from the institution as well as perceptions or beliefs was filled out in most cases by the SWA. The study investigated two measures of compliance, participation rate and financial aid parity, as the dependent variables with various independent variables tested in the relationship. The study found that Division I-AAA schools are more likely to comply than Division I-A or Division I-AA, which sponsor football. She further found that southern schools are less likely to comply and that financial revenue and capacity to access resources will help a school to comply. Finally, she found that attitudes of the key individuals (university president, AD, and SWA) are critical components in determining whether an institution’s athletic program complies with Title IX. A possible concern of the Calkins study is that the people filling out the survey are extremely biased concerning women’s athletics. The SWA, as the most senior woman in the athletic department, is probably an advocate for women’s athletics. A noted and real limitation was that the report only provided the female side of the picture,
instead of providing the whole picture of both genders’ Title IX compliance at each institution.

A 1998 study (Hooks) focused on three Division III institutions and investigated Title IX compliance. Questionnaires were sent to all the coaches and athletic directors at the three institutions, asking for detailed personal information regarding title, age, years of experience in the position, and annual salary. In addition, the athletic director was asked to report enrollment and participation numbers, how changes in the programs to achieve compliance were decided, and the gender of coaches for each of the teams. A copy of the previous year’s budget was requested, as well as a ranking order of participation among the teams between genders. Finally, specific questions were asked to determine the operating strategy of the athletic department in terms of Title IX. An abbreviated questionnaire was given to head coaches at the institutions. Similarly, the coaches were asked personal information regarding age, experience, and salary. The coaches were asked to share information about assistant coaches and participating student athletes. Hooks concluded that institutional compliance with Title IX had been achieved.

Compliance was easier to achieve at these institutions in part, because of their academic missions and their Division III status. Hooks regarded the high academic standards at the three institutions as a driving force in their quest to comply with Title IX (Hooks, 1998). In addition, these schools had women’s athletics before 1972, so it was not a difficult task to achieve gender equity.

Another study by Sjogren (1998) interviewed fourteen athletic directors (ADs) and fourteen coaches. This study focused on several institutions in the Northeast ranging
from Division I, Division II, and Division III institutions. The researcher followed a detailed interview protocol that asked both coaches and ADs their compliance strategies and efforts (Sjogren, 1998). A limitation of this study is that instead of summarizing the data, the researcher recited the exact responses with no analysis of the collective findings.

Hattig’s study (1994) involved one institution. Although, the institution was perceived as a leader in the field, the concern was that compliance strategies implemented by that institution might only work for them. The study was also conducted through an interview process. Hattig interviewed high-ranking officials at a research I institution to gain their opinions, positions, and strategies for compliance with Title IX. Hattig reviewed the institution’s plan for compliance and concluded that the institution was following its plan (1994). The plan allowed the institution to be in compliance and was perceived as a role model for other institutions. In addition, she felt that due to the nature of analysis she was able to get more detailed information. This institution could indeed serve as an example, but there are so few institutions in the country that match its size and athletic resources, and perhaps both of these impacted significantly the school’s ability to comply with Title IX.

A number of studies examined the perceptions of the athletic directors and or college coaches (Campbell, 1987; Crow, 1994; Hull, 1993; Mill, 1981; Wade-Gravett, 1996). One such study even looked at the perceptions of all three: coaches, athletic directors, and college presidents (Wade-Gravett, 1996). She found that the overall perceived compliance was lower for coaches than for administrators (presidents and ADs). Further, head coaches of women’s sports perceived a lower level of compliance in
program financing, scheduling, use of facilities, aids and services for student athletes, publicity, public relations, and personnel compensation. Wade-Gravett’s study showed that there were differences in the perceptions between the groups and concluded that knowledge of compliance should be a priority of everyone involved; coaches, college presidents, athletic directors, and the athletes. The attitudinal study conducted by Crow showed there was a difference in beliefs between athletic directors and senior women administrators (1994) such that there were differences discovered in gender equity and financial differences but not with respect to student-athlete welfare. Athletic Directors wanted no changes in operational procedures while SWAs wanted change. ADs were neutral on potential legal action for non-compliance and equal compensation for coaching, while SWAs were in favor of both legal action and equal compensation. Another study by Lozar, investigated the perceptions of athletic administrators and the legal counsel for the institution. Lozar questioned the likelihood that subjects would file lawsuits against institutions not in compliance (1991).

**Compliance from the Perspective of Student Athletes**

While examining perceptions of gender equity within athletic departments, there was an apparent theme or gap in the literature. The following paragraphs describe the limited research on student athletes and compliance.

Certo (1997) determined that the university in his study was not in compliance with any of the three prong test for compliance. The university has 4400 students and is in the northeastern United States. It is a highly competitive private institution competing
in Division I-AA athletics. In addition, Certo demonstrated perceived inequities in such things as equipment, travel expenses, and publicity. Certo mentioned that many of the subjects surveyed indicated football was to blame for the inequities, although there is no mention of controlling for any of the variables in the study. Another limitation of the study was that Certo only examined one institution.

Another study at Florida State University conducted by Campbell (1987) was also limited to a single institution sample. This study was intended to evaluate the women’s intercollegiate athletic program development for the fifteen years following Title IX inception. The author surveyed administrators and student-athletes regarding their perceptions regarding compliance. In Campbell’s study, she found that when data were examined from documents and reports, Florida State appeared to have met Title IX compliance. Additionally, the survey responses from administrators, boosters, university and program administrators, coaches, and student athletes showed that there was perceived equity in intercollegiate athletics. However, there was a significant difference in the responses for equity attainment by gender. Females perceived gender inequity.

In another study, Hull (1993) examined almost two thousand participants, who were coaches, athletes, and administrators from 100 NCAA Division III institutions. Hull concluded that females, regardless of administrators, coaches, or athletes, perceived there to be less equity than males in perceived equity of five factors used in the study: program support, financial support, sports offerings, scheduling, and changes in the past two to three years (1993). Further results of note were that females perceived less equity than males in all factors; athletes perceived less equity than athletic directors in program
support, financial support and changes; and athletes perceived less equity than coaches in program support and scheduling. Coaches of female teams perceived less equity than coaches of male teams. The investigation of perceptions is interesting in these studies, especially since gender equity did not appear to be a problem when using reported data but became an issue when the data were perceptions of various groups.

In summary, compliance has been a topic of discussion since the inception of Title IX. However, the question should be asked as to how Title IX and compliance will really impact our athletic program? It is here that institutions can use perceptions of student athletes as opposed to quantitative reported data in the identification and implementation of policies and practices of gender equity outcome measures of Title IX compliance.

**Theoretical Perspectives on Student Perceptions**

The concept of “perception” was originally the domain of philosophers (Hochberg, 1998; Jacobs & Michaels, 2002). While it still remains of interest to philosophers, the phenomenon has become an area of study for psychologists, social psychologists, marketing specialists, and others interested in how people relate to the empirical world and other persons (Hochberg, 1998; Wakefield, 1976). Moving from Gestalt theory to more modern day interpretations, theorists in psychology talk about the role of the brain in perception. Theorists in the 1920 are moved toward an approach called behaviorism. In this concept, organisms or people respond to conditions set by the
environment. The remaining aspects of behaviorism on modern day research on perception is a reliance on simple responses – specifically non-verbal. While some would have only objective and observable stimuli play a part in perception, the individual’s introspections or observations are critical in the development of one’s perceptions.

By definition, perceptions describe the process where sensory stimulation is translated into organized experience (Lindsay & Norman, 1977). Humans are able to take what they sense (see, taste, hear, touch, and smell) and convert those “stimulations” into organized experience or the individual’s reality.

A decision-making theory developed by Farr and Spencer in the 1970s, and refined by William Roberts, concluded that we see the world through three separate lenses (Straub, 1987). This TDF theory differentiates between the thinking lens (T), the decision-making lens (D), and the feeling lens (F). These lenses, when considered collectively, condition perceptions of reality.

Researchers have discussed the notion that shared beliefs or perceptions of a family unit have developed into that family’s reality (Habbershon & Astrachan, 1997). In this study, the researchers found that the beliefs of the parents turned into the shared beliefs of the family, meaning the parents’ beliefs or reality became the children’s reality. A common theme in sports is that teams are like families. If the team leaders or coaches believe there to be inequities, this will certainly turn into a shared belief of the team. Some studies (Cooper, 2007; McIntyre, 2006) have used a basic premise in the analysis
of gender equity, that perceptions are indeed reality to the student athletes at these institutions, and as such, may be actually more important than reality.

According to TDF theory, if the student feels something is true, then that is their reality (Straub, 1987). Similar work from Bolman and Deal (1997) discusses how, in the symbolic frame, that the truth is found in how people interpret things. Bolman and Deal (1997) investigated how organizations work. An institution of higher education is certainly an organization where students are the major focus of the organization. Student perceptions play a critical role in the reality of the organization.

Existing literature demonstrates that men and women view the world differently as seen in Chickering (1993). Foubert et al (2005) discovered that important gender differences emerge in especially in the area of tolerance. In the Foubert et al study, not only were women more tolerant at the end of their college experience but they began their experience at a higher tolerance level than that at which men ended it.

Erikson (1950) developed a theory of identity in his early work, *Childhood and Society*, although no women were included. Josselson (1987) expanded on Erikson’s work by constructing her theory of identity development using women in her study. Belenky et al (1986), based their work on a woman’s way of knowing from Perry’s Theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development (1968). There is significant literature from identity to cognitive development that explains the differences between men and women. This supports the notion that men’s and women’s views of gender equity will be different as well.
Conceptual Framework and Research Questions

Popular stereotypes and scholarly literature suggest that males and females frequently differ from each other in their behaviors and perceptions. Indeed, it is has been said that “men are from Mars and women are from Venus” (Gray, 2004), thus underscoring the notion that the divide between men and women is so great that it is as if they are from different planets. While such a statement likely grossly overstates the matter, it is possible that gender differences in life experiences, cultural conditioning, and biology are frequently reflected in differing views and action choices. At the same time, the historical rigidity that once characterized traditional gender roles has lessened in recent years, as men and women increasingly share common activities and perspectives, and important shifts associated with Title IX reforms take place. The current study addresses the following research question:

1. Do male and female athletes perceive gender equity in their school’s athletic programs differently?

Although male and female athletes at the same institutions may participate in many similar activities and often hold similar goals, self-interest and the recognition by women athletes of historical discrepancies in the sport opportunities available to them may negatively color their perceptions of the current situation in regard to gender equity.
Thus, there are two sources of discrepancy for gender. The first is that women think differently than men. The second is that women are treated differently than men.

Moreover, the type of college (public vs. private) attended and/or college experiences and activities in which students participate might also influence their views of gender equity in their school’s athletic programs. The second research question addressed in this study asked:

2. Do type of institution and college experiences influence male and female student athlete perceptions of gender equity?

The study addressed the possible impact of the type of institution (private vs. public), student’s grade point average, total number of semesters he/she had been enrolled, number of varsity sports in which he/she participated, participation in unrelated sports activities, and involvement in non-athletic clubs and organizations. It was expected the greater the student’s involvement in all aspects of the college experience, the more accurate would be their perceptions of gender equity issues in their institution. In cases where compliance with Title IX mandates was high, greater campus involvement would be expected to reflect perceptions of greater gender equity.

Figure 1 shows the conceptual model developed to guide analysis for addressing the second research question. Gender, type of institution, and differing college experiences were expected to have a direct effect on individual perceptions of gender equity.
Summary

In this chapter, the researcher explained the history of Title IX and the implications for practice in the post-Title IX world since 1972. Deciphering some of the more important literature since Title IX was implemented allowed the researcher to develop two interesting research questions:

- Do males and females perceive equity differently in their school’s athletic programs?
- Do type of institution and college experiences influence male and female student athlete perceptions of gender equity?
In the next chapter, the researcher discusses the study, the sample, and the research methodology by which these research questions were answered.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

To address the research questions posed in Chapter One, a survey of student athletes in selected small colleges was undertaken during the 2004-2005 academic year. This chapter describes the procedures used to obtain and analyze the data from that survey.

The Population and Sample

An entire athletic conference within the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference (AMCC), was included in the study. AMCC is a Division III conference, consisting of ten schools primarily in Western Pennsylvania. The conference offered a diverse mixture of settings, with five private and five public institutions. Four institutions had relatively young intercollegiate athletics programs established within the last ten years, while six institutions had over ten years’ experience in the NCAA or NAIA (National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics). There was a wide range in the types of sports teams each institution fields, with only one offering a football program. Although all ten schools would be considered small colleges, there was considerable variation among them in number of students enrolled. Three institutions (Penn State Altoona, Penn State Behrend, and Frostburg State University) had over 3900 students each, while the remaining seven each had fewer than
2000 enrollees. The locations of these institutions varied as well. Five institutions (LaRoche, Penn State Behrend, Lake Erie, Hilbert, and Medaille) are situated within 15 miles of a major city (Pittsburgh, PA; Erie, PA; Cleveland, OH; and Buffalo, NY), while the other five are located in rural areas or small towns. Four were affiliated with larger public universities, while the remaining were private institutions. All student athletes (i.e. students who participated in varsity or intercollegiate sports programs during the 2005-2006 academic year) in these ten institutions were targeted for study – a total of about 1900 students.

Data Collection

Athletic directors at the institutions were contacted and asked for assistance in contacting and surveying all student athletes at their colleges. In some cases, the athletic director provided a comprehensive student athlete participation list and appropriate electronic mail (e-mail) addresses. In other instances, the athletic directors sent a prepared email from the researcher to their student athletes that included a web address or link to the on-line survey. An on-line survey tool ("Zoomerang: Online Survey Software," 2007) was used to aid in preparing the survey and compiling the results. The use of the internet and World Wide Web to deliver surveys and collect data has been shown to be highly successful in collecting information from students (Upcraft & Wortman, 2000). One study reported an 80% response on a web-based academic survey conducted from Penn State’s University Park Campus (Marine, 2000), with almost a
fourth of these returns in the first twenty-four hours. Since students are exposed to computers in kindergarten or earlier, the current generation of students in higher education have “grown up” with computers, their daily lives are often centered on computers, and they were expected to be comfortable answering questions on-line.

An introductory e-mail was sent by either the researcher or the college’s athletic director to each of the student-athletes; briefly describing the study, requesting the student athlete’s participation, and providing a link to the web-based survey (see Appendix F). The e-mail included contact information for the researcher and the researcher’s advisor, and a description of the incentives offered for completing the survey. All students completing the survey qualified to participate in two $50 raffles. In addition, if the student’s institution submitted at least thirty responses and 40% of the total student athlete population, a second separate raffle was held for that institution with a $50 award.

All survey materials were submitted to and approved by Penn State’s Office for Research Protections Social Science Institutional Review Board (IRB) before usage (http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/areas/humans/index.asp).

After four to five days, a follow-up e-mail was sent as a reminder to complete the survey, which included the link again. For the institutions that provided e-mail addresses, the researcher was able to send e-mails directly from the on-line survey instrument. For the other institutions, the researcher made a special request to the athletic department to send out a reminder email on the researcher’s behalf. The researcher was informed that the reminder was sent. In both cases, there was a spike in completed surveys after the follow-up request was made. The second time the students were contacted, there was
another short description of the survey, the study, and the appropriate web address.

Students were asked to submit their e-mail address if they were interested in being eligible for the raffle. Over 90% of the students chose to submit their e-mail for the raffle. The e-mail information eliminated duplicate and erroneous submissions, as well as validated responses for the raffles.

Over 1800 surveys were sent with a total of 450 students completing usable surveys. While students from all ten institutions participated, there were varying response rates among the schools. Penn State Behrend and Penn State Altoona both had response rates over 50%. The University of Pittsburgh at Bradford and Mount Aloysius College both had low response rates, 5% and 8.6% respectively. Medaille College had a 27% response rate, while the other five schools ranged between 13% and 17%. The overall response rate was 24.2%.

**The Survey Form**

The on-line questionnaire was constructed to measure the perceptions that student athletes had of gender equity in the athletic programs at their institutions. Included were questions designed to directly assess students’ views of whether their institution treated men and women athletes differently, and, if so, which gender was treated “better.” Additional questions asked about the athlete’s college experiences, including the type of institution, GPA, the number of semesters in school, total number of sports in which the student competes in college, and athletic and non-athletic involvement.
The Constructs

Measuring Gender Equity

In 2003, Good Sports Incorporated suggested that compliance with Title IX was not simply a matter of the number of men’s and women’s teams that an institution supported, but rather compliance should be judged by a comprehensive analysis of every component of athletics. They identified thirteen programmatic areas that were relevant in analyzing the extent to which gender equity was present and whether the institution was in compliance (Good Sports Inc. & Title IX and Gender Equity Specialists, 2003).

1. Athletic scholarships
2. Athletes equipment and supplies
3. Pay and services provided by coaches
4. When games are played and practice times
5. Training facilities
6. Dining facilities and other arrangements
7. Medical and training staff
8. Tutors or academic assistance provided
9. Meal money and travel expenses
10. Publicity of individuals and teams
11. Other support services provided to student athletes
12. Accommodations of interests and abilities
13. Recruitment of future athletes
In the current study, each student athlete was asked his/her opinion on whether either gender was treated better than the other in regard to each of these items using a five-point scale as follows:

1 = Women are definitely treated better than Men
2 = Women are treated slightly better than Men
3 = Men and Women are treated the same
4 = Men are treated slightly better than Women
5 = Men are definitely treated better than Women

Responses to these items were coded and analyzed in two different ways. First, to determine the differences (if any) between the perceptions of male and female athletes in regard to treatment of men and women in their school’s athletic programs (Research Question #1), the above five response categories for each item were reduced to three categories:

1) Women were treated better than men (codes 1 and 2 above);
2) Women and men treated the same (code 3);
3) Men were treated better than women (codes 4 and 5)

Research Question #2 focused on the differences among student athletes in their perceptions of gender equity in their institution’s athletic programs. To arrive at an overall indicator of the extent to which these students perceived equity in the treatment of athletes at their institutions, a composite Gender Equity Score was obtained. This was done by recoding the original response categories to the thirteen items so that the extremes (codes 1 and 5) were scored as “1”, while 2 and 4 were scored “2”. Code “3”
remained the same. Thus, for each item, the responses were re-coded so that a high score (“3”) meant equal treatment for men and women, a “1” identified that one gender was definitely treated better than the other gender, and “2” was intermediate. The mean score for the 13 item scores was then calculated for each student in the sample as an overall indicator of the extent to which he/she perceived Gender Equity in the school’s athletic programs. Cronbach’s Alpha for the composite indicator was .82, indicating an acceptable level of reliability. This will be called the Gender Equity Index.

Independent Variables

In addition to the variables of gender (female vs. male), the relationships of selected college characteristics of the students to their perceptions of equity as measured by the Gender Equity Score were assessed to address Research Question 1. These included the following variables summarized in Table 1 and Table 2:

Table 1 Frequency Distributions for Gender and Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>253 (57.8%)</td>
<td>185 (42.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113 (25.1%)</td>
<td>337 (74.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Institution.
The ten institutions in the sample were classified as either “Private” or “Public” on the basis of Peterson’s Guide ("Peterson's Guide," 2007). Five of the schools were classed as “Private (1)” and five were “Public (2).” However, the number of students in
the sample in public institutions was nearly three times the number of those in the private institutions.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for College Experience Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Actual Minimum</th>
<th>Actual Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>On a 4-point scale</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semesters</td>
<td>Numeric values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sports</td>
<td>Numeric values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic involvement</td>
<td>1=Not at all involved to 5=Very involved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-athletic involvement</td>
<td>1=Not at all involved to 5=Very involved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade Point Average.

Students were asked to report their current college/university Grade Point Average (GPA). Grades were measured on a 4-point scale, with “4” the highest possible average.

Semester.

The total number of semesters the student reported he/she had attended the current institution was used to indicate semester standing.
Number of sports.

The survey form asked each student athlete: “Which intercollegiate sports have you ever competed in at your institution?” A count of the number of such participations for each student was used to index the level of their varsity sport involvement.

Athletic involvement (not related to intercollegiate sports participation).

Respondents were asked: “Apart from athletic activities required for your participation in your intercollegiate sport(s), how involved are you in OTHER athletic activities on campus (e.g. intramurals, recreational sports, weight room, jogging, etc.)? Five response categories were provided: 1=Not involved; 2=Involved a little; 3=Somewhat involved; 4=Pretty involved, 5) Very involved.

Non-athletic involvement.

To assess non-athletic involvement, students were asked: “Excluding ALL athletic activities, how involved are you in OTHER clubs and organizations? The same 5-reponses involvement categories were used to assess this variable as were provided athletic involvement not related to intercollegiate sports.

Statistical Procedures

For Research Question #1, differences between male and female athletes in their perceptions of the treatment of men and women (equal/men better/women better) were described by presenting the frequency/percentage distributions of their responses to each of the thirteen items measuring gender equity. The statistical significance of the observed differences tested for statistical significance using contingency chi-square analysis. Throughout the manuscript, the level of statistical significance used is p≤ .05.
For Research Question #2, the relationships of gender, type of institution, GPA, and the various college experience measures to the Gender Equity Score were assessed using bivariate and multiple correlation-regression methods. Gender was coded for the regression analysis with 1=female and 2=male and type of institution coded with 1=Private, and 2=Public. Both Semester and Number of Sports were measured by actual numeric values reported. The measures of Athletic Involvement (not related to intercollegiate sports) and Non-athletic Involvement (other clubs and organizations), while measured using an ordinal scale, were scored and treated as interval variables. Treating of ordinal scales as interval data has been shown to provide useful results and has become widely accepted in cases where the ordinal variables consist of five or more categories (Mayer, 1971).

Preliminary analysis of the interrelationships among the independent variables used in this analysis provided information on the extent to which gender and college experiences were linked. The multiple regression allowed for assessment of the partial or net effect of gender, institutional type, and various college characteristics, statistically controlling for the other variables in the model.

**Limitations of the Analysis**

This study was limited to student athletes. It does not address ALL students, even though athletes would be the group to whom the matter is most relevant. The inclusion of non-athletes would allow the researcher to compare student athlete perceptions with
non-student athlete perspectives. The student athlete group is also the group who would be expected to be most knowledgeable.

Another limitation is that the study dealt with one conference in a specific region of the United States. There may be specifics of this conference or the region that make it unique. The researcher expects that, given the region of the country, the nature of Division III athletics, and the relatively small college environment, the sample is very homogenous. This is confirmed from the sample characteristics. As a result, the researcher can hypothesize that the perceptions of the sample will also be fairly consistent.

Further, there are some important variables that were not included in the study. These included an entire category of pre-college characteristics. It is reasonable to expect that there are entering characteristics of students that may influence their perception of gender equity. Some of these variables would include high school GPA, number of colleges that recruited the athlete, number of sports played in high school, and mother’s and father’s education. The overall profile of an entering student could be presumed to affect their perception of gender equity.

One item within the study asked about the student-athlete’s involvement in other sports. The alternative of “0” or no other sports was excluded, thus reducing the possibility of an accurate response for those athletes who only participated in one sport. Institutional variables were also not used in this study, thus adding a limitation. The school may have dropped men’s teams over recent years or had other factors that could have influenced the outcome.
The schools at which the researcher had close ties had a far higher return rate. Also, the limitation of size of school and the Division III status also limits the generalizability of the results.

Finally, the sample size is fairly small. This restricted inclusion of more variables and more complex modeling of the topic.

Summary

In this chapter, the researcher described the methodology for testing both research questions concerning gender equity. The first research question used specific gender equity factors and investigated the differences between the perceptions of male and female student athletes. The second question drew upon a conceptual framework in which two main concepts were seen as having an effect on student perceptions of gender equity -- the student’s gender and the nature of his/her college experiences. With the appropriate permission from conference and institutional officials, a web based survey was carried out that examined the perceptions of gender equity, basic demographic information, and individual characteristics of student athletes at ten institutions belonging to the same athletic conference (AMCC). In addition, the researcher conducted individual interviews with the athletic directors, where possible, to assist in the description of the environment that exists at the institutions.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Background of the Analysis

Before we examine the results of the study, it is important to understand the setting in which the study was done. Data from secondary sources, interviews with the Athletic Directors (ADs) at the participating institutions, and personal observations contributed to describing this setting.

The AMCC is an athletic conference within Division III athletics in the NCAA. Institutions across the country are able to determine the division of the NCAA in which they would like to compete. A common misperception is that size determines the division, but institutions determine which philosophy of athletics best meets the institutional mission of their school. Division III places importance on the impact athletics has on the athlete, not the spectators. There are no athletic scholarships awarded, and the institutions ensure that, outside of athletics, the student athlete is treated and held to the same standards as every other student at the institution. Division III encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletic opportunities for their students. The philosophy of Division III athletics is evident in the AMCC Conference and its individual institutions (see Appendix for NCAA philosophy). In short, the philosophy calls for an emphasis on an integrated experience in which athletics is a part. Coaches play an integral part of the educational experience. Cultural diversity
and gender equity are at the center of the philosophy. The members of the AMCC are functioning visibly as called for by the philosophy statement.

The focus on the student-athlete in the Division III philosophy reinforces the topic of this thesis and leads us to attempt to understand the students who attend Division III institutions. A term prominent in conversations concerning parent involvement is "helicopter parents." These parents tend to hover over their children and try to manage their lives and intervene whenever needed, or possible (White, 2005). In the age of "helicopter parents," high school students are driven like never before. Many student athletes spend much of their high school years seeking the Division I scholarship that is going to pay for their schooling. There is not enough money or roster spots available for all the athletes who feel they are worthy of the privilege of playing scholarship athletics. Division III institutions provide opportunities for students to continue their participation in sports they grew up playing.

The Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference consists of ten institutions primarily located in Western Pennsylvania along the Allegheny Mountain Range. The size of the schools ranges from a little over 400 full time students to over 4300. The size of the athletic departments has a similar range from 139 to 508 student athletes. However, the high number is certainly an outlier, for the next highest program has 258 students. The total number of athletic teams has a very similar range as well, with three schools with ten teams, while one has 17 teams. There are two institutions that have 11 teams, while another two have 12 teams. The remaining two have similar numbers but
report them differently. One school has 14 teams, while the other reports 11, which includes three co-ed teams.

The conference was established in 1997 with six original members and grew to ten members by 2004. Many of the individual institutions established athletics after 1972. So many of the schools, and the conference as a whole, have only known the world of athletics with Title IX. As a rule, the institutions did not need to change their ways after 1972, these schools were able to implement Title IX practices from the ground floor.

Being a young conference also has its disadvantages. The AMCC conference schools compete in a world with many choices for higher education. These institutions do not have the academic prowess that always attracts students. In addition, their athletic programs have not established themselves as feasible options for many students. The institutions are sometimes regarded as slightly better than community colleges. If a student is not able to get accepted at their number one option, then they will still be able to attend their safety school. Many of the institutions are enrollment-driven and rely on out of-class activities, like athletics, to recruit students. For some schools, achieving compliance with Title IX is made more difficult, because they are small enrollment driven institutions. They are also somewhat handicapped by the types of majors, programs, degrees, and even history of the institution. Many of the athletic departments are primarily driven by the overall institutional mission. The institution may insist on the athletic department bringing in a specific number of students. Title IX then becomes a secondary concern. The goal turns into bringing in athletes, no matter what gender, and
then sorting out how to make things equitable. Some of the smaller schools must follow institutional goals, while also complying with Title IX. As one could expect from a numbers standpoint, it remains extremely difficult in turning a potential student athlete away from a team to ensure Title IX compliance.

**OCR Three Prong Test for Compliance**

Although compliance is usually tested on an individual institutional basis, for the purpose of this study the researcher examined the conference as a whole in terms of compliance. The Office of Civil Rights has a three step process to determine if institutions are in compliance. The three prong test may appear to be complicated, but the fact is, if any one of the prongs is acceptable, then the institution is in compliance. The first prong examines substantial proportionality, which states the institution must have a comparable female student athlete population to the regular female student population. The second examines if the institution has a history of program expansion for women. The third prong identifies whether the institution has properly met the interest and abilities of their female student population regardless of the results of the first two prongs.

The first step is to critically examine prong one. If prong one is in compliance and there is substantial proportionality, there is no need to move on to any of the other prongs. If not, then examine prong two. If this prong is in compliance, there is no need to continue, and the institution is in compliance. If it is not, then prong three is
considered. If prong three is in compliance, then the institution is in compliance. If none of the prongs are met, then the institution is not in compliance.

By examining prong one across the conference, there appears to be a significant gap or difference in percentages. With over 18,400 students at the ten institutions, females represent approximately 52.2% of the total population. According to standards put forth by the OCR, the conference would need to have a female student athlete population that is representative of the entire student population. The conference would need to be within 1-2 percentage points to be considered in compliance with prong one. The conference has slightly over 2,000 female student athletes to make up 43.5% of the student athlete population. Prong one is certainly not in compliance as there is almost a 9% difference, with 5% identified by Alden (2002) as an acceptable difference.

Following OCR standards, the researcher moves on to prong two which determines if there is a history of expansion of athletics programs for the under-represented gender. The OCR has determined that a history should be a period of the last ten years. Anything beyond ten years does not represent a history of recent program expansion. There is evidence that the conference as a whole has a history of program expansion, and there appear to be similar plans for the future. The individual institutions have grown over the past ten years, by either adding female teams or teams that included both men and women. For example, men’s and women’s cross country teams and men’s and women’s swimming teams have been added over the years. In addition, several female only teams have been added. There has been a push to add women’s golf to the conference with a number of schools adding the sport. And finally, women’s bowling is
being explored as a possible conference sport. Several institutions have already added the team to their institution. Many of the athletic directors spoke about the importance of recruiting for the female teams. The conference is spending approximately $11 more per athlete to recruit females than it is to recruit males (Table 3). One athletic director mentioned that there was an ongoing search for a coach of a female team and that it was critical to bring in someone that knew how to recruit and could interest young women in participating in athletics. The AD felt the position would obviously get filled, but it was incumbent on them to bring in the best candidate possible. Many of the ADs commented that they were personally active in the recruitment of women for teams at their institutions. A number of schools reported hanging signs in residence halls and cafeterias in an effort to obtain a sufficient number of women for their female teams.
**Table 3 AMCC Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total AMCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Full time Undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Athletic Participants (unduplicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Varsity Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE/Male Student Athlete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE/Female Student Athlete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec/Male Student Athlete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec/Female Student Athlete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using data reported to the Department of Education, operating for male and female athletes were calculated for the conference. A comparison of operating expenses per female athlete to the operating expenses per male athlete yielded only a $40 (~4%) difference with expenditures for females slightly exceeding that for males ($993/male student athlete vs. $1033/female student athlete). One athletic director indicated the women’s teams at his school performed better and had post season opportunities, which increased their expenses. Another institution showed a large difference in roster spots

---

1 Data Source: Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act, 1994.
(opportunities available), but was remedying the situation by spending significantly more for the female athletic programs.

Some of the ADs mentioned that recruiting was the focus for Title IX compliance at their institutions. Individual recruiting at these institutions was seen as the best indicator that the schools were attempting to provide equitable services for males and females at their institutions.

Although the ratio of student athletes to the total student population was not in alignment at the time of the study, the schools appeared to be on the path to meeting this compliance option. From hiring energetic coaches to spending more on recruiting, the athletic directors appear to be attempting to meet gender equity compliance. It is clear the conference is providing opportunities for women to compete in intercollegiate athletics. Two of the institutions were recently cited in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* for their progress in Title IX. One school was noted for having a female athlete student population 16% points higher than their female student population, while another was noted for increasing participation spots by 129% for women since 1998-1999 (Lipka & Wolverton, 2007). The schools in the conference easily satisfy the second prong of Title IX compliance by exhibiting a practice of continuing to provide opportunities for women. Since the second prong was in compliance, there was no need to examine the third prong. However, it is clear that if more females were interested, there would be opportunities for them to compete in this conference.

In a society that publicizes negative behavior, we hear about the student athlete that gets arrested for underage drinking, the booster member that buys a car for an
athlete, and the problems with the playoff system in college football. We seldom hear about the student athlete with a 3.5 GPA that performs countless hours of community service, or hundreds of coaches and staff that enhance the college experience for student athletes by providing the athletic experience. The AMCC represents the philosophy of the Division III schools. They are ten member institutions clearly involved in providing opportunities for their student athletes regardless of gender.

Analyses

Student perceptions of gender equity were the focus of this study. In the Title IX literature and court cases, there was little information concerning what students thought about equity at their institution or the athletic conference. The on-line survey of student athletes at all institutions in the AMCC Division III conference provided data for addressing the following research questions:

1. Do male and female athletes perceive gender equity in their school’s athletic programs differently?
2. Do type of institution and college experiences influence male and female student athlete perceptions of gender equity?

Research Question #1 Analysis

The responses of the male and female athletes concerning whether they believed that “women are treated better than men”, “men and women are the same” or “men are treated better than women” in regard to thirteen programmatic areas were compared (see
The statistical significance of the differences between males and female respondents’ answers were tested for significance using chi-square for contingency.

Table 4 Comparison of Gender Equity Programmatic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Areas</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Women treated better than Men</th>
<th>Men and Women are treated the same</th>
<th>Men are treated better than Women</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Phi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Support Services</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>43.843</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Individuals and Teams</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>39.841</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Facilities</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>35.872</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Scholarships</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>35.533</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Money for Away Trips</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>29.739</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation of Interest and Abilities #</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15.663</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times for Games and Practices</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>15.455</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Training for Coaches</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>5.461</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors or Academic Assistance #</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.366</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and Training Staff #</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Facilities and other</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrangements #</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of Future Athletes</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Categories were run with 2X2 crosstabs due to small n's
*significant at .001 level
The null hypothesis for each one of these tests was that there was no difference in how male and female student athletes responded to the differences in treatment between male and female student athletes in each area. For every programming area, females were more likely than males to indicate that men were treated better than women while males were more likely to see the treatment of men and women as “the same” or that women received preferential treatment. For eight of these differences, the responses of male and female subjects differed significantly at the .001 level. Significant differences were found in the following areas: other support services offered by the institution, equipment and supplies, publicity of individuals and teams, training facilities, athletic scholarships, meal money on away trips, institutional accommodations for the interest and abilities of the student population, and the times for games and practices.

There are significant differences in the way that men and women view eight of the thirteen programmatic areas for gender equity. These are arranged in order of the significant difference in Table 4.

The first area of difference in perception is “other support services” ($\chi^2 = 48.55; \varphi = .334; p < .001$). Institutions survive with the help of auxiliary services, which include transportation, housing, and food services. Within this context, there are a number of things that serve in an auxiliary role for college athletics. These services would include all ancillary support services. While most of the men (84.8%) and the women (63.9%) felt that men and women were treated the same, over 35% of the women felt that men were treated better. It is unclear as to why women would feel men were treated
differently in ancillary services since the source of the services would be the same throughout an institution.

The second area of significant differences in the way men and women view gender equity is in their perception in the area of “equipment and supplies” ($\chi^2 = 43.84; \varphi = .316; p < .001$). This area was one of the few categories that less than half of the women (42.7%) reported men and women were treated the same compared to the 66.0% of the males who felt men and women were treated the same. This trend was similar for those that felt men were treated better than women, however the numbers were reversed. Less than 25% of males reported men were treated better, while 53.8% of women felt the same.

Institutions are not necessarily required to spend the same amount of money on women’s and men’s athletics. The main concern is that the equipment must be comparable. If the football program is going to have new pads every year, then female teams should get similar benefits. The female teams do not get to spend the same amount of money the football team spends, but if above average products were purchased, then the female team can expect above average equipment as well (Carpenter & Acosta, 2005). Similar to Certo’s study, women perceived unequal treatment in equipment and supplies. Non-compliance in equipment and supplies is typically a little easier to detect. Some of the ADs interviewed indicated that males typically had more “wear and tear” on the uniforms than did females; thus, more frequent purchases for male student athletes were required.
There was a statistical difference in the way men and women viewed “individual and team publicity” ($\chi^2 = 39.84; \phi = .303; p < .001$). Over half of the females (53%) surveyed felt that men were treated better than women with “individual and team publicity.” This is consistent with the literature. In one study, Shaker in 2000-2001 found that men’s basketball games were televised at a four to one rate of women’s basketball games (Shaker, 2007). It should be noted that 62% of the men felt that men and women were treated the same while over 43% of the women felt that treatment was equal.

“Training facilities” were also perceived to be significantly different between men and women ($\chi^2 = 35.892; \phi = .286; p < .001$). Nearly 27% of the women felt that men were treated better with respect to the training facilities. This was more than four times the proportion of men (5.9%) who felt they are treated better. However, from the viewpoint of a perception of equity, 84.9% of the men and 70% of the women felt that treatment with respect to training facilities was equal.

In Division III athletics, scholarships or aid based on athletic endeavors is prohibited. However, in this study “athletic scholarships” are perceived to be significantly different between males and females ($\chi^2 = 35.533; \phi = .289; p < .001$). A possible interpretation for this difference is the amount of financial aid a student athlete may be receiving due to family economic status with no relationship to athletics. Some institutions are more likely to give aid to athletes, which is a violation under Division III regulations. The NCAA actually audits institutions’ financial aid offices to ensure the institution is not unfairly awarding money to athletes. Although there was no indication
that this occurred in the sampled institutions, it does happen enough for the NCAA to conduct audits. Therefore, students may believe that there are inequities here whether or not they actually exist. In the sample, females were almost three times as likely (35.5% compared to 12.6%) to report that men were treated better than women when it came to the distribution of athletic scholarships. However a majority of both men (82.4%) and women (63.3%) reported that there was no difference between how men and women were treated. Only about ten people in the entire sample felt that women were treated better than men. The perception reported is consistent with the national data that shows men receiving more financial aid or athletic scholarships than women (Carpenter & Acosta, 2005, p. 177).

“Meal money for away trips” was also perceived to have a significant difference between men and women ($\chi^2 = 29.74; \phi = .262; p < .001$). Women were nearly five times more likely (24.2% vs. 4.9%) to believe that men are treated better than women. Once again from a perception of equity, a majority of both men (86.3%) and women (70.6%) believed that men and women were treated equally. This is also consistent with prior studies (Good Sports Inc. & Title IX and Gender Equity Specialists, 2003; Hattery, Smith, & Staurowsky, 2007).

“Accommodations made for the interest and abilities of the student athletes” was perceived by over three quarters of the student athletes surveyed to be the same for men and women. However the difference in perception was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 15.66; \phi = .196; p < .001$). Males (91.8%) were slightly more likely than females (77.1%) to feel accommodations made for interest and abilities were the same. Females
(21.1%) were more likely than men (4.3%) to feel the accommodations and interests of men were more often met than that of women. Even with over 3/4 of the females in the sample feeling that treatment was the same, there still were some women who felt that men are getting better treatment than women. Most of the student athletes have self-selected these schools, so there is not a large outcry for sports that do not exist at these institutions. That may explain the high rate of perceived equal treatment. Some of the recent court cases have involved accommodations of interest and abilities, which may lead women to be a little more in tune to this fact. Slippery Rock University, in a different athletic conference, recently settled out of court, in such a case, and has promised to make substantial gains in accommodating the interest and abilities of female student athletes over the next three years ("Slippery Rock University settles Title IX lawsuit," 2007). This case was in litigation when this survey was administered, however it is not obvious to the researcher that the students in this study would have responded differently had this litigation been settled or they knew of the lawsuit.

“Equity in scheduling” also showed a significant difference between perceptions of women and men ($\chi^2 = 15.455; \varphi = .188; p < .001$). Equity in scheduling compares the total number and time of day of competitive contests per year. The number, length, and time of the practice opportunities are also considered along with pre and post season opportunities that are factored into equity in scheduling (Carpenter & Acosta, 2005). Males (76.2%) were slightly more likely than females (68.0%) to feel men and women were treated equally in scheduling. Females were almost twice as likely (29.2% compared to 15.7%) than men to report that men were treated better than women, but
again more than two-thirds of both men and women felt that men and women were treated the same. A very small percentage of males (8.1%) and females (2.8%) reported that women were treated better than men.

In summary, despite some differences between the male and female subjects in how they viewed these programmatic issues, the majority of the respondents indicated that treatment was “the same” for men and women for 11 of the 13 items. In two of the items, equipment and supplies and publicity of individuals and teams, about 53% of women perceived that men were treated better than women. Based on the data collected, these two categories are important starting points for institutions when addressing gender equity.

**Research Question #2 Analysis**

The second research question dealt with gender, the type of institution, and various college experiences’ influence on the perceptions of gender equity. The perception of gender equity was indexed by a Gender Equity Score. These scores ranged from 1 to 3 with the higher the score the more the subject perceived the treatment of male and females athletes at their institution to be the same, while the lower the score, the more differences in treatment were perceived. In addition to type of institution (public vs. private) five college experience variables were considered: GPA, semester, the total number of sports the student athlete competed in at the institution, Athletic involvement (activities not required for your sport), and Non-athletic involvement (clubs and organizations).
Interrelationships

The bivariate correlations among the independent variables (gender, type of institution, and the five measures of college experience variables) were calculated to assess the extent to which these factors were interrelated with one another (see Table 5). The basic null hypothesis was that there is no relationship between each of the two variables specifically selected. With seven independent variables, there were 21 relationships.

Table 5 Interrelationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender (1=female; 2=male)</th>
<th>Type of Institution (Private =1; Public =2)</th>
<th>Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Semesters</th>
<th>Number of Sports</th>
<th>Athletic Involvement (not required for your sport)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>-0.138**</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semesters</td>
<td>0.093*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.114**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Involvement</td>
<td>-0.149***</td>
<td>-0.146***</td>
<td>0.129**</td>
<td>0.172***</td>
<td>0.132**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not required for your sports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-athletic Involvement</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.087*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.244***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig: \( p<.05 \); \( p<.01 \); \( p<.001 \)
Regarding the interrelationships, females tended to have higher GPAs and the correlation was significant ($r = -0.138; p<.01$). Females also tended to be more involved in athletics activities not required for their primary sport ($r = -0.149; p<.001$). On the other hand, males tended to be further along in their college program as evidenced by the total number of semesters enrolled ($r = 0.093; p<.05$).

There were also some interesting relationships concerning public and private institutions. Private college students tended to be involved in a greater number of sports in college ($r = -0.220; p<.001$) and also tended to be involved in athletics related activities not required for their sport ($r = -0.146; p<.001$) than public college students.

Another significant relationship with GPA was the positive relationship of level of Athletic Involvement (not required for their primary sport) ($r = 0.129; p<.01$). Except for gender, no other independent variable had any statistical relationship with GPA. In this relationship, the higher the GPA, the more involved the student was in activities unrelated to their primary sport.

The total number of semesters (Semesters) enrolled had a statistically significant relationship with the Number of Sports: the higher the number of semesters, the more sports in which they competed ($r = 0.114; p<.01$). Also the higher the number of semesters, the greater the Athletic Involvement (not required for their sport) ($r = 0.172; p<.001$). Finally, the more semesters the student had been enrolled, the more involved they were in Non-athletic activities (clubs and organizations) ($r = 0.087; p<.05$).

A positive relationship exists between the total number of sports and Athletic Involvement (not required for their sport) ($r = 0.132; p<.01$). As the total number of sports
increased, so did the students level of involvement in athletic related activities not
required for their sport.

The level of Athletic Involvement (not required for their sport) had a statistically
significant correlation with their Non athletic Involvement (clubs and organizations) (r =
.244; p<.001). The more involved in either Athletic Involvement or Non-athletic
activities, the more involved they would be in the other (Athletic Involvement or Non-
athletic Activities).

Of the seven independent variables, perhaps the most interesting set of
relationships were the ones associated with Athletic Involvement (not required for their
sport), which had a significant relationship with all of the other independent variables. In
summary, females were more involved than males in athletic related activities not
required for their sport, and students at private institutions were more involved in athletic
related activities not required for their sport than students at public institutions. For the
other relationships, there was a positive correlation with athletic involvement not required
for their sport. As these variables increased (GPA, Semesters, Number of Sports, and
Non-athletic activities (clubs and organizations)) so did the level of Athletic Involvement
(not required for their sport).

Testing the Conceptual Model

The bivariate and partial relationships (controlling for the other independent
variables in the model) of gender, type of institution, and the five college experience
variables to the Gender Equity Index were assessed using correlation-regression analysis (see Table 6).

Table 6 Bivariate and Multiple Correlation/Regression Analysis for the Relationships of the Independent Variables to Gender Equity Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Bivariate R</th>
<th>Final Model b-value</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.269***</td>
<td>.171***</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution (Private or Public)</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>.074*</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semesters</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Involvement (not required for their sport)</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-athletic Involvement (clubs and organizations)</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple R</strong></td>
<td>.307***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R square</strong></td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05  
** *p < .01  
*** *p < .001

The seven independent variables accounted for 9.4% of the total variation in explaining the Gender Equity score. The Multiple R value was .307, significant at the .001 level.

Women were more likely than men to feel there were inequities in how male and female athletes were treated at their institutions. This was true in the bivariate case and
when the effects of the other variables were controlled. In addition, students at private institutions were more likely than those at public institutions to feel there were inequities and this relationship persisted even when gender and the college experience variables were adjusted for. Controlling for the effects of the other six independent variables, there was a significant relationship between grade point average and the gender equity score. The higher a student’s grade point average, the more likely they felt the dynamics at their institution were equitable.

None of the remaining college experience variables were significantly related to Gender Equity scores. Simply put, there was no statistical support for a conclusion that students who competed in more sports perceived gender equity any differently than those that did not compete in as many sports; there was no statistical support indicating that students who have been enrolled longer at the institution had any different perceptions than those who had been enrolled for a shorter time; there was no statistical support that indicated a difference in perceptions of equity with the level of Athletic Involvement (not required for their sport); and there was no statistical support that indicated the level of Non-athletic Involvement (clubs and organizations) had any impact in how they perceived gender equity at their institution.

Summary

Research question one asks if male and female athletes perceive gender equity in their schools’ athletic programs differently. While a substantial percent of men and women perceived equitable treatment, some women perceived that men were treated
better than women. Areas of perceived inequity included equipment and supplies, publicity of individuals and teams, training facilities, athletic scholarships, meal money, and times for games and practices. Also, both Other Support Services and Accommodation of the Interests and Abilities of Athletes were perceived differently by male and female athletes. However, both of these categories were sufficiently vague and prone to multiple interpretations by respondents. Thus, we are not able to derive policy from these two areas. Knowing the areas of perceived inequity will help institutions in the development of policies and practice.

In research question 2, the differences in the perception of gender equity between male and female athletes by type of institution, and college experiences are investigated. Gender, public or private institution, and GPA were all significant contributors to the perception of gender equity. Women were more likely to perceive inequities; students at private institutions were more likely to perceive inequities; and students with lower GPAs were more likely to perceive inequities. It was also interesting that some of the college experience variables were not significant. While further study is needed, these findings are also important for setting policies and procedures for action within athletic departments and colleges.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will give an overview of previous sections by reviewing the purpose of the study and giving a brief description of the methods employed. Based on the findings, the hypotheses will be evaluated. The researcher will finish this section by discussing implications for practice and possible future research possibilities.

While there has been a fair amount of research on Title IX, most of the work has been done on compliance. Some of the more robust studies have focused on the administrators, senior women’s administrators, and coaches. However, as noted previously, there is a glaring lack of information on the perceptions of student athletes. The premise of this thesis is that there are a number of factors that affect a student athlete’s perceptions of gender equity. These factors may include gender as well as characteristics that students assimilate during their college career.

The extent to which students viewed their institutions as equitable was explored in this study within a single athletic conference of Division III institutions. All student athletes at each of the ten institutions were contacted although the response rates were significantly different at the various colleges. It should be noted that the characteristics of Division III athletics and the mix of public and private colleges within the conference provided a good basis for the study.

The ultimate purpose of the study is to provide recommendations for policies to athletic directors and administrators at the colleges.

The study examined two research questions listed below:
• Are there differences between male and female athletes in how they perceive the treatment of male and female athletes in their school’s athletic programs?

• Does the type of institution and college experiences influence the male and female student athlete perceptions of gender equity?

The first task of the researcher was to define the perceptions of gender equity. The researcher used the thirteen programmatic areas as questions with a five-point scale ranging from “women are treated better” to “men are treated better”. The items were used in two different ways in response to the research questions. In response to the first question, the item responses were collapsed from a five point scale to a three point scale and determined whether men and women perceived a difference in equity. For the second question, the items responses were used to determine a Gender Equity Index upon which the researcher built a conceptual framework to explain factors that affect the student perceptions of gender equity. The researcher identified a set of six characteristics that the students acquired during their college experience as college characteristics. Additionally, the researcher included gender as a factor that affects student perceptions of gender equity. Listed in Table 7 are the variables the researcher used in the analysis.
### Table 7 Variables by type and description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td>Perceived Gender Equity</td>
<td>Mean score of the thirteen programmatic areas (3 point scale with 3=treated equally; 1=treated differently)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1=Female; 2=Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>1=Private; 2=Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Self-reported numeric (on a 4.0 scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semesters</td>
<td>Numeric values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Sports</td>
<td>Numeric values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Involvement (not required for their sport)</td>
<td>5 point Likert Scale (1=not involved; 5=very involved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-athletic Involvement (clubs and organizations)</td>
<td>5 point Likert Scale (1=not involved; 5=very involved)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Procedures

Background information on the setting for the study was obtained by interviewing the athletic directors at each of the sample institutions and by assessing data collected by the United States Department of Education.

A total of 450 students at the ten colleges provided an assessment of comparative treatment of males and females at their institutions and on the extent to which gender
equity was perceived in 13 programmatic areas: equipment and supplies, publicity of individuals and teams, training facilities, athletic scholarships, meal money on away trips, accommodation of interest and abilities, practice and game times, professional training for coaches, tutors or academic, medical and training staff, dining facilities, other support services, and recruitment of future athletes.

For the first research question, the perceptions of male and female athletes were analyzed regarding equity in treatment or if one gender was treated better than the other. For the second research question, a Gender Equity Index was computed to measure the extent to which men and women perceived equal treatment across the 13 programmatic areas. A multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relationship of gender, type of institution (public or private), and college experiences to the Gender Equity Index.

Findings and Discussion – Programmatic Areas

For six of the eight areas, the majority of student athletes responding to the survey felt men and women were treated “the same.” However, there were significant differences in how men and women perceived their treatment, with women reporting at a higher rate than men, that men were treated better than women.

Overall, there were clearly differences in how men and women perceived the treatment of male and female student athletes. Of the 13 programmatic areas used to measure perceptions of gender equity, there were differences in the perceptions of men and women in eight of the areas. Two of the eight, other support services and
accommodation of interest and abilities, were deemed un-interpretable due to the lack of clarity of the questions.

**Training Facilities**

Women were more likely than men to report that men were treated better than women regarding training facilities, gymnasium, practice and playing fields, pool and track (27% vs. 6%). This finding was unanticipated, as the very nature of these institutions makes it necessary for similar sports to share their respective facilities between teams and with the general student population. How could a basketball team feel the baskets in the gym are better for the men than they are for the women? A possible explanation is that women felt that men had more access especially during peak hours. Part of this explanation appears to be a game and practice scheduling issue which will be addressed in a later section. On the use of facilities, if men’s coaches are savvier in encouraging individual training with their athletes in the off-season, then the athletic departments must make sure the coaches in the women’s programs take a similar approach. For some, it might be as simple as educating the women’s coaches as to what they are allowed to do in the off-season, and what their athletes are allowed to do. This may empower the coach to contact their team, and thus encourage the student athletes to train, if interested. For others, it might be necessary to educate the athletes. This can be done in formal or informal situations. At the beginning of year, the athletic director should meet with teams to go over department and NCAA rules. This meeting could be used as a forum to educate students about issues that may be unfamiliar to their coaches.
In addition, the conference schools have a student athlete advisory committee, where representatives of each team meet at a regular time with an administrator from the athletic staff. In this forum, the staff can educate the representatives about opportunities available to them. Informally, staff can encourage members of teams to sign up for gym or weight room times.

Another possible explanation deals with access during the off season. Off season access may be a key to perceptions of their athlete’s access to training facilities. The NCAA allows a finite amount of time for coaches to work with their teams. Outside of their playing seasons, coaches and athletic department staff are restricted from organizing athletic-related activities with student athletes. In Division III, the goal is to allow students to focus on academics during these times. However, student athletes are allowed to organize athletic-related events. A team captain may reserve the gym at an institution for team members to play pick-up basketball. So, it is possible the men’s coaches are better prepared in getting the students to take advantage of resources during the non-traditional seasons. In addition, the longer tenure of men’s coaches adds stability to these programs and players from year to year are familiar with department policies.

**Athletic Scholarships**

As mentioned earlier, the NCAA does not permit the awarding of athletic scholarships at Division III institutions. In addition, the NCAA conducts a financial aid audit at each of the member institutions to ensure the institution is not awarding money to athletes at a higher rate than other students. Nevertheless, women were more likely than
men to report that men were treated better than women in terms of athletic scholarships. Since the NCAA is closely monitoring financial aid departments and it is against the rules to award athletic aid, how do female student athletes perceive unequal treatment? The reason may be that there are simply more male athletes at most of the AMCC schools. While the 56% male student athletes might not be enough to alter female perceptions, it is a possible reason why women feel that men receive more athletic scholarships. Some reports indicate that men are more likely to boast than women. One study revealed that, when reporting grade point averages, men enhanced their actual number while women did not (Daubman & Sigail, 1997). Females are less likely to want to be seen as overly competitive or bragging about their athletic accomplishments (Leaper & Friedman, 2007). It may also be that males are more likely to brag about their athletic prowess and want to feel important at these institutions.

The researcher explored the possibility that student athletes were construing athletic scholarships to be financial aid. However, there was no difference between males and females and their reported socioeconomic status of their families. This may be another case of advantage for a full time coach versus a part time coach. Full time coaches who are on campus all the time are more likely to utilize resources such as the financial aid office.

Coaches and staff should not discuss awards and scholarships that students are getting based on need or academic merit. The athletic administrator running the Student Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) meetings should address scholarship funds available at the institution, especially need and merit-based.
Practice Time and Game Time

Despite over 71% of all student athletes feeling that men and women were treated the same in the allocation of times for practices and games, there was a difference in perceptions by gender. Females were more likely than males to feel men were treated better than women (29% vs 16%). Scheduling of practice and game times is something that is relatively easy to fix and control for equity between genders.

There is more to this category than which gender has the second game in a double header. Pre-season, post season, practices (number and time), and games (number and time) are other important factors. In conversations with the athletic directors, there was some question and concern over what constituted the prime practice and game times.

Each year, athletic directors should assess students’ concerns in scheduling games. As an example, many times the men’s and women’s basketball games are scheduled on the same night to facilitate travel by the visiting team. The women usually play early and the men play later. That would encourage student athletes to feel that a later game is “prime time”. However, some coaches and students have indicated they prefer to “play” the early game. A study at each school or across the conference would be a quick way to determine the student athletes’ preferences. Once determination of the prime time game is established, a pre-determined rotation of who gets the prime time game could influence perceptions of gender equity. In addition, in this particular conference, the commissioner determines when the conference games are played and who plays first. The conference
commissioner should balance the schedule and alternate who gets the prime time game. This is a very visible solution to ensure gender equity.

Open communication is important when scheduling practice times. There are many factors for full and part time coaches that could affect these times. Full time coaches may have a class to teach, while part time coaches have a full time job to consider. It is important for a coach to consider the class schedule of their athletes, if possible. A team may have a number of science or engineering majors who have labs late in the afternoons. The coach may be able to adjust for that. The athletic director should consistently stress the importance of teams and coaches working together to get a balanced and feasible schedule for practice. If there are conflicts or if teams want the same times, then the athletic director should alternate who gets the times.

The athletic director should mandate a minimum percentage of games a team is allowed to play. For example, teams are given a maximum number of games they can play, if the men’s teams routinely compete in the maximum number of games, while women’s teams compete in 75% of their available games, there is a gender equity concern. This is especially important within the same sport, so while soccer allows for twenty dates of competition, the athletic director should mandate that each team competes in, at least, say seventeen contests. By mandating the number of contests each season, the athletic director is able to ensure that men and women are having similar experiences at their institution. In addition, the athletic director should set up a table of contests for each sport and archive the information for consistency purposes.
A final suggestion is to be consistent in allowing teams to compete in the post season. While the NCAA tournament seems to be an automatic, there are some tournaments that athletic directors may choose not to send teams. Thus, there needs to be a consistency between men’s and women’s teams. An easy policy is to always allow teams to compete in the post season if they are eligible, unless of course there are disciplinary reasons to do otherwise.

**Distribution of Meal Money**

Many of the athletic directors specifically mentioned the distribution of meal money when referring to equitable measures between genders. However, despite over 75% of all student athletes reporting that men and women were treated the same, women were more likely than men to report that men (24% vs. 5%) were treated better than women. This programmatic area points to an obvious fact that athletic directors are not the only factor in ensuring gender equity. At each of the institutions, even though the athletic director may assign money equitably to the teams, it is the coaches who choose how to distribute the money. The men’s basketball coach may decide to take the team to an all-you-can eat buffet and spend all of their allotted meal money. The women’s basketball coach may stop at a fast food chain on the way home and turn in several hundred unused dollars. In this case, the perceptions of the female student athletes will be that the men are treated better than the women.

The athletic director should determine a formula for how meal money will be distributed. The best way to ensure students do not feel a team or gender is getting
preferential treatment is to have the same money amount of money distributed and used by both.

The athletic director should establish an approved list of places to eat. In addition, the coach and/or athletic department should keep a list of where teams eat. The coaches should give possible options to the teams while on the road. A team may have decided to get fast food because they want to return home sooner. If the teams know the decision was theirs, then they are not likely to perceive inequities.

**Equipment and Supplies**

Almost 46% of the entire population of those surveyed felt that men were treated better than women when it came to equipment and supplies provided by their teams and athletic departments. This was one of two categories in which less than 50% of the women felt men and women were treated the same. Women were more likely than men to feel that men were treated better than women (54% vs. 23%). This category is probably one of the more visible categories when it comes to gender equity.

Athletic directors should focus on three aspects of equipment and supplies: the quality, the number, and the maintenance. The quality and number are simple to monitor. The maintenance includes where the supplies are stored, when uniforms are laundered, and who takes care of the equipment. Be consistent and be fair is the best advice for maintenance. If the equipment manager folds uniforms and places them by the players’ lockers for one gender, make sure it is done for the other.
Each institution should generate a list of basic needs for each sport. Each team should expect to have each item on the list each year. In addition, the athletic director should generate a list of “extras” for each sport and team. There should be directions for how each team can achieve the “extras.” For example, a soccer team should expect: a jersey, new socks, balls for practice, and a travel bag. The extras would include; a sweat suit, warm-up top, and new shoes. If the soccer team is able to fundraise $1500 then they are able to buy a sweat suit, but if they are able to raise $3000, then each team member will receive a pair of shoes as well.

Athletic directors should implement a system to monitor the equipment and supplies of all of their teams. Just as institutions report numbers for gender equity, each institution should keep a record for the equipment and supplies. They will be able to easily access how often each team and gender achieved some of their “extras.” In keeping these records, the athletic directors will be able to adjust what is a basic need and what is an extra.

**Individual and Team Publicity**

Over 46% of the entire population of those surveyed felt that men were treated better than women when it came to publicity of individuals and teams provided by their athletic departments. This was one of two categories in which less than 50% of the women felt men and women were treated the same. Women were more likely than men to feel men were treated better women than (53% vs. 25%). This category is probably one of the more visible categories when it comes to gender equity. Since the institutions,
as a whole, are small, many of the categories are inherently equal, like the basic support services and facilities. However, to the student athletes at small institutions, publicity and equipment are important. This finding highlights the importance of these issues to the administration and staff dealing with gender equity.

The athletic director should insist the sports information director provides equivalent types of support for all programs. They need to make sure the amount and types of publicity and promotions are equitable.

Since the institutions are relatively young, the athletic departments should predict how they will celebrate accomplishments by teams. If a plan is in place, once the teams begin to achieve these goals, there’s not a case for gender equity. For example, in 2007 a women’s team wins the conference for the first time, and then in 2008 the men’s team wins the conference. At this institution in the Fall of 2008, they decided to give personalized plaques to teams that won the conference. The appearance could be that it was important because it was the men’s team.

The athletic director should meet with the local media and address the institutions concerns with publicity and gender equity. An athletic director cannot control what a television station puts on the news, but they can make their opinions heard to stress the importance of all sports and teams.

The sports information director should develop a plan in distributing information. The school’s website is the only form of publicity that the athletic department can totally control. The sports information director should be more aggressive in publicity for the women’s teams to help offset what the local media may do. In addition, the order in
which articles appear on the web site are important. It would be advisable that regardless of the team or gender, that articles are placed on the website in an order that is clearly not gender based, say in the order in which the event finished.

**Professional Training for Coaches**

There was no significant difference between men and women in their perceptions of gender equity. However, approximately 30% of the student athletes surveyed felt that men were treated better than women. The market for female coaches may explain these perceptions. There are fewer female coaches than male coaches in college athletics. Because there are fewer female coaches overall, the more qualified female coaches are typically coaching at higher levels of the NCAA. As a result, if an institution wants to hire a female coach, they are forced to hire one with fewer years of coaching experience or lower qualifications.

At these institutions, there are three kinds of full time coaches. There are coaches that only coach and do not have “non-coaching” responsibilities. There are full time coaches that also have teaching responsibilities, and there are coaches that have other duties not associated with their sport. There are no data to suggest that coaches for female sports have any more or fewer of these full time positions. However, the athletic director should balance these roles. For example, it would not be equitable if an institution has four full-time positions, with two being full time coaching duties for men’s basketball and football, and two positions with other duties in the institution in addition to coaching women’s volleyball and women’s soccer. While all four coaches are full
time, in this example, there appears to be a preference for the men’s sports teams. The coaches for the women’s teams would not be able to spend as much time on their sport as the men’s coaches are able to spend. Equity would be achieved when the men’s basketball coach is a full time coach and the women’s basketball coach (or another comparable sport) has a full time coach as well.

The athletic director should have a complete list of the full time, part time, and volunteer coaches for their department. In addition, they should establish an equitable number of coaches for their teams. For example, if the men’s soccer team has a full time coach, a part time assistant, and two volunteer assistants, then the athletic director should strive to have the same numbers for the women’s soccer team.

The athletic director should compensate coaches of women’s teams equitably compared to the coaches of men’s teams, or they should pay higher rates to attract more qualified coaches for women’s teams. While they should encourage all coaches to receive additional training, they should be very supportive for coaches of women’s teams. For example, the NCAA hosts a Women’s Coaching Academy. Several institutions in the conference are sending female coaches to the conference.

**Recruitment of Future Athletes**

Although men were somewhat more likely than women to perceive equity in the treatment of future athletes, this difference was not statistically significant. However, nearly 25% of all student athletes felt that men were treated better than women when it came to the recruitment of future athletes. The athletic directors described a priority on
recruiting female student athletes which was supported by the financial findings from the Department of Education with most institutions reporting either equal or more funding for recruiting female athletes. The total number of male athletes compared to female athletes could have an effect on how the students perceive recruitment. In addition, because there is a perception of better coaching for males than females, those same coaches may be better recruiters.

Athletic directors should monitor their coaches in their recruiting efforts. If there appears to be inequities, then the athletic director needs to encourage their coaches of women’s teams to recruit more or to recruit a higher quality athlete.

**Programmatic Areas Showing No Significant Differences**

Three of thirteen areas showed no significant difference between men and women in how they perceived the treatment of males and females. There were no significant differences between men and women in tutoring and academic assistance, treatment from medical and training staff, and dining facilities. As discussed earlier in the Background of the Analysis, the conference as a whole has limited resources. Most of the institutions only have one dining facility. There are similar restrictions in terms of academic support for students. Many of these institutions have constraints on their training staff. Therefore, providing athletic trainer support at every practice and game is a bonus at most of these institutions. The findings support this with over 90% of all students feeling that men and women were treated the same in these areas.
Athletic directors should continue to make academic assistance at their institution equitable. While they may not have any control of these departments, the way the athletic department promotes tutoring services and encourages their athletes to attend, needs to be consistent between men and women. They also need to monitor what their coaches are doing for academic assistance. If a coach for a men’s team has mandatory study hall, while there are no women’s teams doing the same, then the athletic director needs to take action to ensure gender equity. A possible solution is to make the study hall available to all student athletes, or to provide a comparable service for a women’s team.

Athletic trainers need to have an established routine in treating student athletes. It needs to be a first come first serve basis, or a priority scale. If a student needs to be treated before a game, then that student athlete gets treated before the one that is on their way to practice or the one that is in the off-season.

**Un-interpretable data**

Two of the areas were deemed un-interpretable. The researcher felt that with respect to other support services, the question was ambiguous. There was no definition for other support services and students may have felt that if there were issues with any of the support services mentioned, that they should identify problems for this category as well.

The other category regarding accommodations of interests and abilities may have been equally unclear. Several of the athletic directors mentioned that their students may have had some problems understanding this question. Since there was no definition of
this term, the results are unusable. There are too many alternative possibilities for how students may have interpreted this question.

**Findings and Discussion – Conceptual Model**

In the following paragraphs, the findings of the conceptual model are discussed. These include the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

*Determining the relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable*

A dependent variable measuring the degree of inequity was crafted from questions asked in the survey. The original thirteen programmatic areas were the foundation for this variable. Each of the thirteen variables was transformed according to their scale and then combined to create a mean score of those thirteen variables to create the gender equity score. The original responses were modified into a three-point scale in which a “3” or high mark represents equal treatment of men and women, while a “1” indicates that one gender is definitely treated better than another. Thus, the responses for each of the thirteen programmatic areas were *folded* to form the new scale (3 = 3; 2 & 4 = 2; 1 & 5=1). A mean score of the modified scale for the thirteen programmatic areas was calculated to determine the gender equity score.

There are seven independent variables that are included in the regression model: gender, type of institution (private or public), GPA, total number of semesters enrolled, Number of Sports, Athletic Involvement (not required for their sport), and Non-athletic Involvement (clubs and organizations).
Since four of the institutions were affiliated with two larger institutions (Penn State and the University of Pittsburgh), the researcher expected these schools to be more conscious of equity because of the guidance from the larger institutions. In addition, since two of the public schools have female athletic directors, the researcher expected treatment to be similar at these institutions and that would be reflected in the student perceptions. The researcher expected to find student athletes with higher grade point averages to have a better understanding of Title IX. Finally, that the level of involvement or length of time at the institution would give the student athlete a clearer perception of what was occurring with gender equity at their institution.

Only three variables (gender, type of institution (private or public), and GPA (grade point average), were significantly related to the gender equity score, while the total number of semesters enrolled, the total number of varsity sports in which the student was involved, participation in athletic related activities (not related to their sport), and participation in non-athletic activities (other clubs and organizations not related to sports) were not significant predictors of the gender equity score.

**Significant Variables: Gender, Type of Institution, and GPA**

While the variance accounted for is not high (9.4%) and many of these variables are not significant, gender, type of institution (public vs. private), and GPA were significantly related to the Gender Equity Index in the regression. Regarding the gender variable, women were more likely than men to feel that there were inequities. This concept goes to the very core of Title IX. If the female student athlete feels that their institution is not achieving equity, then there are problems. Within the AMCC, we are
able to see that the institutions are striving to be in compliance and many are doing a fine job as it relates to gender equity. However, the fact remains that students are perceiving inequities. The athletic director should educate the student athletes, coaches, and entire staff of the measures taken to ensure gender equity. While the student athlete does not necessarily need a Title IX seminar, they do need to hear directly and indirectly about the actions the institution is taking to achieve gender equity. They need to be constantly made aware of institutional efforts with respect to gender equity at their school.

Students at private institutions were more likely to identify perceptions of gender equity than students at public institutions. While the researcher believes there needs to be more research done in this area, there are some possible explanations. The first is that, overwhelmingly, the two largest responders in the study, Penn State Behrend and Penn State Altoona, recently received special recognitions for their Title IX compliance. Penn State Behrend was noted for having a significantly higher proportion of female student athletes than proportion of females at the institution. In addition, Penn State Altoona was noted to have significantly increased their offerings for women over the past seven years. This sample proportion may have skewed an otherwise insignificant variable to being significant. The other possibility is that there are four public schools in the sample that belong to, or are branch campus of, major research institutions. These research institutions are more likely to comply with public regulations in order to keep federal and state funding coming to the institution.

Students with higher grade point averages perceived greater equity in the treatment of student athletes. Higher GPA students may be more aware of the activities
of the institution on Title IX efforts and compliance. We need to be sure to educate all of these students with respect to what the institution is doing to achieve gender equity and to continually reinforce that message.

In summary, the results of the overall regression indicate that the important factors that impact the Gender Equity Index are gender, type of institution, and GPA. Thus, our overall research question concerning gender influence on the Gender Equity Index is supported.

**Non-significant Independent Variables**

There are a number of possible explanations for the lack of significance of the time enrolled in college (Semester) and the extent of athletic involvement. When controlling for the effects of the other independent variables, the amount of time at the institution and the total number of sports in which the student competed had no effect on gender equity perceptions. This is surprising to the researcher as it was hypothesized that the greater participation in sports, or more time spent at the institution, would have a positive influence on perceptions of gender equity in the institution.

The first explanation deals with the research method. Another explanation deals with time. Do these students change their perceptions of gender equity with more time spent associated with an athletic program? Based on this study, the question cannot be answered unless there is further study.

Student athletes perceptions of gender equity may be set early in the college experience or perhaps even during the recruiting process. The conclusion might be that the recruiting process and the first semester appear to be the time when students develop
their perceptions of gender equity at their institution for the next four years. The upper division students (juniors and seniors) help define the culture for the lower division students (freshmen and sophomores). Older students may perpetuate certain perceptions of gender equity among the younger ones.

On the practical landscape, it is important to educate or inform new students about what the institution is doing to ensure gender equity. Coaches appear to be a critical component in delivering direct and indirect messages about gender equity at their school as they have immediate, direct, and frequent contact with the student athletes. The variable, involvement in other athletic activities, proved to be statistically non-significant. These activities are athletic-related but not required for their sport (i.e. Club Sports, intramurals, or basic fitness activities). Thus, there is no relationship between level of involvement in other athletic activities and their perceptions of gender equity. This variable could also be a proxy for the quantity and quality of their total athletic experience. The more they were involved in athletic activities, the more accurate their perceptions of gender equity would be.

Since the athletic component of college characteristics was not significant, one could draw similar comparisons to the total number of sports and also number of semesters the student was enrolled. Since these variables were also not significant, the implication is that the students’ perceptions of equity do not change based on their extent of athletic involvement on campus in either multitude of sports (total number of sports) or length of time (Semesters). Non-athletic Involvement refers to student groups and organizations. Since there are not typically issues of equity in such groups and
organizations, the researcher believed that those involved in other areas of the campus, thus removed from the athletic culture would be able to tell if there were issues of inequity once back in the athletic environment. Since the general student population was not sampled, there is no way to determine if students involved in non-athletic related activities at the schools perceived equity in their out of class experiences. While the non-significance of this variable may mean that these institutions are doing a good job with their gender equity, it may also mean that there is no difference in perceptions of equity either in athletics or in outside activities.

**Implications for Practice**

Gender equity is a concern for the entire institution, but in athletics it begins with the athletic director. The athletic director is the leader of the department and needs to set the tone for the department. Likewise, the department will be a reflection of the athletic director. This study seems to suggest that perceptions of equity are important. Therefore, each athletic director needs to establish direct and indirect measures to ensure gender equity and to assure that these efforts are recognized by staff and students. The athletic director may directly impact the perception of gender equity through policies established in the department. For example, one athletic director mentioned that it was known throughout the department that every team received new uniforms every four years. This is a direct measure that is obvious to everyone involved. There is an expectation on the part of both male and female athletes that the uniforms will arrive without regard to sport or gender. Many of the athletic departments in Conference
schools spoke about having Title IX literature posted in the athletic buildings. This is another direct measure that athletes and students are able to see.

Athletic directors may have the most influence indirectly. The athletic director needs the help of the entire institution to implement gender equity. The athletic staff and coaches are the messengers for the athletic directors in many situations. However, coaches have the most important role in developing perceptions of gender equity. From the initial meeting or communication and through ongoing direct contact with the student athlete, the coach conveys the gender equity message through his/her attitudes and actions. The coach is the student athlete’s main point of contact with institutional policy and practice. Student athletes typically spend more time with their coach than they will with their academic advisor or favorite professor. During the recruiting process, it is the coach that describes the culture and environment at the institution. Right from the beginning, the coach needs to consider the messages sent to players and potential players. He/she needs to be aware of negative perceptions of gender equity, both directly and indirectly, especially for female athletes. Some students will select other institutions if they perceive athletic inequities or even a chilly climate in that regard.

Coaches are with the players at early morning practices and on late night bus trips where every action and every word speaks volumes to their players. The coach is the both the first and the last representative of the athletic department and, for most athletes, embodies its mission. A coach needs to be attentive to athletes and other institutional personnel making comments about equity. They need to address any misperceptions immediately.
Athletic directors should be aware of perceptions of gender equity and take remedial action where appropriate. Each school has a student athlete organization called the student athlete advisory committee (SAAC). This committee is usually comprised of student athletes from each team. SAAC provides a forum for student athletes and administrators to discuss issues that arise during the year. Athletic directors should use SAAC as a forum to communicate with their student athletes about concerns of gender equity. For example, they are able to discuss the purchasing of equipment and supplies for the team, or even how coaches and teams decide to spend their meal money.

Athletic directors should be transparent in their support of and the priority placed on gender equity at their institution. They should make the institutional support a matter of policy. Some institutions have an athletics handbook that includes statements about gender equity.

Freshman orientation is often done in the summer prior to the students’ arrival for the academic year. Parents are invited, and many attend, to learn about the campus and the support for their child. There are specific sessions for parents of student athletes that should be used to discuss intercollegiate athletics, and the representative can make sure to discuss gender equity.

The NCAA requires Division I coaches to pass a test regarding recruiting. Athletic directors could implement a similar policy for their coaches regarding rules and policies at their school. Coaches could be forced to pass an institutional or conference certification to coach that would include gender equity issues.
The athletic director should document current situations regarding standards and practices at their institution. Then any equity issues could be dealt with over a period of time. In addition, if there are any retro-active complaints, the athletic director will be able show documentation of things they have done. Athletic directors should assess their students in exit interviews as well.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study examined the effects of gender and college characteristics on student athlete perceptions of gender equity. Based on the findings and the process of the study, a number of topics for future research are suggested.

1. Future research should be completed on a larger scale, both in number of institutions and number of students within institutions. Having a larger sample size at each college would allow the research to reveal trends at particular institutions, while having more institutions would allow the researcher to compare and contrast different types of institutions. A more heterogeneous sample, drawing upon a larger sample, would allow for comparisons between Divisions I, II, and III.

2. The study should be expanded to include all students. A more complete view of campuses should involve non-student athletes. The notion that involvement in non-athletic activities does not impact gender equity in athletics could be proven or refuted.

3. In addition to a larger sample, future research should include additional institutional characteristics. There are a number of institutional
characteristics that could affect student perceptions of gender equity. Possible institutional characteristics include, dollars spent per athlete at each institution, size of the schools, and locations of the campuses.

Limitations of Study

Some of the limitations of the study were identified beforehand, while others were recognized during the process. These included the sample demographics, unequal proportion of respondents across the conference schools, inordinate proportion of soccer respondents, low response rates at some institutions, and generalizability of findings from this conference to others.

All of the respondents in the study were involved in athletics. To get a better sense of gender equity at the institutions, it is necessary to survey both athletes and non-athletes.

Also, students that care about their institution, athletic departments, and Title IX compliance would be more likely to take the time to fill out the survey on line. This fact would render a sample that may not be representative of the total student-athlete population at the institution.

While the researcher’s involvement in this conference was important in facilitating of the current study, that same involvement is also a limitation to the study. Two of the subject institutions, Penn State Altoona and Penn State Behrend had the two highest response rates and accounted for over half of the student athletes in the study. The researcher is employed at the former and has a number of close acquaintances at the
latter. Thus, the sample was disproportionate in the number of respondents from these two schools that coincidentally have similar characteristics.

Since the researcher is a soccer coach, well networked in the conference, the other soccer coaches may have been influential in requiring their athletes to respond to the study. This may have contributed to the large number of soccer student athletes (32.7%) when compared to other sports that completed the survey. The limits of the data collected may also include a low response rate from certain schools. While Penn State Altoona and Penn State Behrend had very good response rates (>50%), Mount Aloysius and University of Pittsburgh Bradford had response rates of less than 10%. Thus, comparisons among schools were not possible. The conference selected for the study is a Division III conference that does not resemble a majority of athletic conferences in the country. Most of the schools have relatively young athletic programs, some in existence for less than ten years. It is a conference that began with Title IX already in play. Older conferences have had to change existing policies in the late 1970’s or early 1980’s. The institutions in the AMCC have grown in both size and athletic maturity while factoring Title IX into their policies.

The conference only has one school that participates in intercollegiate football. Previous research suggests that institutions that had more male sports, without a similar number of women’s sports, were institutions that struggled with compliance. Usually it was football and/or wrestling that skewed athletic participation toward male athletes. Institutions with compliance problems have added crew as a women’s sport or have even removed men’s sports, such as soccer and volleyball.
Finally, the AMCC. is a relatively young division III conference of small schools that have tight-knit organizations. Title IX is a “hot button” issue for these athletic directors, coaches, and school presidents. While quantifiable data are available through the United State of Education, athletic directors or individual interviews may provide a more biased view. Athletic directors may have attempted to tell a slightly skewed story of their institutional compliance to the researcher, who is also a conference coach/member, in an effort to look better. Title IX compliance may be more effective in a young conference that required compliance from its inception. A number of the athletic programs were founded after 1972 and the passage of the Title IX amendments.
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Appendix A

NCAA Division III Philosophy Statement

Division III Philosophy Statement

Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience, and in which coaches play a significant role as educators. They also seek to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff.

To achieve this end, Division III institutions:
(a) Place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (students, alumni, institutional personnel) than on the general public and its entertainment needs;
(b) Award no athletically related financial aid to any student;
(c) Encourage the development of sportsmanship and positive societal attitudes in all constituents, including student-athletes, coaches, administrative personnel and spectators;
(d) Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for their students;
(e) Assure that the actions of coaches and administrators exhibit fairness, openness and honesty in their relationships with student-athletes;
(f) Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body;
(g) Assure that athletics programs support the institution's educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the programs through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution. Further, the administration of an institution's athletics program (e.g., hiring, compensation, professional development, certification of coaches) should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission;
(h) Assure that athletics recruitment complies with established institutional policies and procedures applicable to the admissions process; *(Adopted: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04)*
(i) Assure that academic performance of student-athletes is, at a minimum, consistent with that of the general student body; *(Adopted 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*
(j) Assure that admission policies for student-athletes comply with policies and procedures applicable to the general student body; *(Adopted: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*
(k) Provide equitable athletics opportunities for males and females and give equal emphasis to men's and women's sports;
(l) Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents; *(Adopted: 1/12/99)*
(m) Give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships; and
(n) Support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance,
which may include opportunities for participation in national championships, by providing all teams with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities.

The purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members in developing the basis for consistent, equitable competition while minimizing infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs. The above statement articulates principles that represent a commitment to Division III membership and shall serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs by institutions and conferences.
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**Appendix B**

**Human Subjects Documentation**

**APPLICATION FOR THE USE OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS**  
*(FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH)*

******** HANDWRITTEN APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED ********

*This form is not valid after 04/2005.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Perceptions of Gender Equity among Student Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
<td>John M Parente, Jr. PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): jmp296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Status (Faculty, Staff, Student, etc.):</td>
<td>Student/Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmp296@psu.edu">jmp296@psu.edu</a> Telephone Number: 814-949-5735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>3000 Ivyside Dr. Altoona, PA 16601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept:</td>
<td>Student Affairs College: __ Campus: Altoona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Faculty Advisor, if applicable: | Robert Hendrickson PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): rmh6 |
| Email Address:                 | rmh6@psu.edu Telephone Number: 814-863-1489 |
| Mailing Address:               | 241 Chambers Building University Park, PA 16802 |
| Dept:                          | Associate Dean-Research & Graduate Studies College: Education Campus: University Park |

| Co-Investigator:              |                        |
| PSU User ID (e.g., abc123):   |                        |
| University Status (Faculty, Staff, Student, etc.): |                        |
| Email Address:                |                        |
| Mailing Address:              |                        |
Is there anyone you wish to include on correspondence related to this protocol (e.g., a study coordinator, etc.)?

Name: ______________________  PSU User ID (e.g., abc123): ______________

University Status (Faculty, Staff, Student, etc.): ____________________________

Email Address:_________________ Telephone Number:_______________________

Mailing Address: _______________________________________________________

Dept:________________________ College:__________Campus:________________

1. Check category of review requested:  ____X____ Exemption Review (allow 3 weeks for review, please submit one original and one copy of the application for review)

_____ Expedited Review (allow 3 weeks for review, please submit one original and one copy of the application for review)

_____ Full Review (Contact ORP or visit ORP website for timelines, please submit one original and 17 copies of the application for review)

2. Project timelines:

Anticipated start date*: ___

(*This date cannot precede the IRB approval date)

OR project will begin upon IRB approval:  _X_  (Check if applicable.)

Approximate ending date:  ____August 1, 2005  

3. Indicate the name and mailing address of internal and external sources of funding. IF APPLICABLE, A COPY OF YOUR GRANT PROPOSAL MUST BE INCLUDED WITH THIS APPLICATION.

4. Does this protocol involve any biomedical procedures to human participants?  ____ Yes**  XX  No
5. **IF YES, do not complete this application for review. Please complete the Application for the Use of Human Participants for Biomedical Research.**

5. Is this a class project? _____ Yes** ** _X_ _ No

**IF YES, provide the name of the instructor and the course.

6. Do you or any individual who is associated with/responsible for the design, the conduct, or the reporting of this research have an economic interest in or act as an officer or a director for any outside entity whose financial interests would reasonably appear to be affected by this research project? _____Yes** ** _XX_ _ No

**IF YES, refer to Penn State Policy RA-05 for additional information.

7. **PURPOSE:** Please keep response brief and to the point.

a) What is the purpose of this project?

The purpose of this project is to identify the perception gender equity among student athletes at the colleges and universities in the Alleghany Mountain Collegiate Conference (AMCC). This is a dissertation project in which I hope to any concerns with gender equity at these institutions. I have obtained approval in principle from the college presidents/chief executive officers and the athletic directors at a meeting in September of 2004.

b) What is the research question for this project?

There are two research questions to be explored. The first question will examine he perceptions of gender equity within intercollegiate athletics at ten separate NCAA division III institutions. The second question will determine if there are differences between genders, socio-economic status, race, education, and a couple other demographic variables and their perceptions of gender equity.

c) What will participants be asked to do? Provide a step-by-step process.

College student athletes from 10 separate colleges and/or universities will be sent emails from the researcher. The email list will be provided by the athletic directors at each institution. The email will explain the study and ask the student to participate. They will be provided a link to a survey instrument on-
line which will take them to the survey. They will be asked to fill out an on-line survey that is approximately 20 questions long and will take less than 10 minutes to complete.

On a separate occasion, the athletic director from each institution will be interviewed by the researcher to gain information and knowledge about their program. The information gathered will be used to help create a background of information of equity concerns at each institution.

Upon completion of the survey period, the incentives will be chosen at random and the students contacted. For institutions that provide at least 50 participants, they will receive a $25 gift certificate randomly selected for only their students. The overall sample will be eligible for the randomly drawn $100 gift certificate.

d) Where will this project take place?

The athlete’s survey will be administered on the web and will take five to eight minutes. The administrator’s survey will be a structured interview and will take place by telephone. Interviews with the campus administrator will take approximately 20 minutes. The researcher is a doctoral candidate in the School of Education and on the staff at Penn State Altoona.

e) How long will participants be involved in this project? Include the number of sessions and the duration of each session.

Approximately 10 minutes to respond to survey during a single session. Students will be sent 2 reminder emails to fill out the survey. Once they complete the survey, they will not be contacted again regardless of the time they filled it out.

NOTE:

- As principal investigator, it is your responsibility to ensure that all individuals conducting procedures described in this application are adequately trained prior to involving human participants.
- All personnel listed on this application are required to successfully complete the Penn State Training on the Protection of Human Participants (http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/hum/train/intro.html). APPROVAL WILL NOT BE GRANTED UNTIL ALL INDIVIDUALS HAVE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED THE TRAINING.
- As personnel change, you must submit a memo to ORP as a protocol modification.

8. PERSONNEL AND THEIR QUALIFICATIONS
a) Including yourself, provide the name of each individual (all students require faculty advisor information), along with his or her PSU Access User ID, who will be responsible for the design or conduct of the study, have access to the human participants, or have access to identifying and confidential information. If the individual does not have a PSU Access User ID, please provide some other form of contact information:

***PLEASE NOTE: The email address, PSU Access User ID and Mailing Address do not need to be included for individuals listed at the beginning of the application.***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>PSU Access User ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Parente, Jr.</td>
<td>Penn State Altoona 207 Slep Hall 3000 Ivyside Dr. Altoona, PA 16601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmp296@psu.edu">jmp296@psu.edu</a></td>
<td>jmp296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert Hendrickson</td>
<td>PennState University 241 Chambers Building University Park, PA 16802</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmh6@psu.edu">rmh6@psu.edu</a></td>
<td>rmh6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) For each person identified in 8a, identify his/her role in the project and clearly state the procedures or techniques he/she will be performing:

John Parente will be primarily responsible for data collection, analysis, and reporting. Robert Hendrickson will serve in a supervisory role.

c) For each person identified in 8a, describe his/her level of experience with the procedures or techniques he/she will be performing:

The researcher, John Parente, is a doctoral candidate in the School of Education. He will be working under the guidance of the dissertation committee (chair Robert Henderson) on this project.

d) Where did each of the personnel listed in 8a receive the training to perform the identified procedures and who supervised or provided the training (not referring to online human participants training)?
• John Parente received training in the doctoral program at Penn State University in the School of Education.
• Robert Hendrickson received his training from Indiana University with a doctorate in Higher Education and a minor in Law. In addition, he remains current in the field through publications and research.

e) Please explain how these skills/abilities will be periodically evaluated:

The skills are constantly reassessed by the doctoral committee and as a result of publishing research and professional development.

9. PARTICIPANTS:

Equitable Selection of Participants:
In order to determine whether some classes (e.g., welfare patients, particular racial and ethnic minorities, or persons confined to institutions) are being systematically selected simply because of their easy availability, their compromised position, or their manipulability, rather than for reasons directly related to the problem being studied, the IRB is charged with ensuring that the enrollment of participants is equitable and free of coercion. Selection criteria should consider all populations that might potentially benefit from the research.

a) Estimated number of males to be involved*:

unknown

Estimated number of females to be involved*:

unknown

Estimated total of participants to be involved:

<2000

Estimated number of people from historically underrepresented groups to be involved*:

unknown

*Note: If you plan to exclude a group of individuals from historically underrepresented groups or a gender from the research, please provide a scientific rationale for doing so:
Anyone who meets the criteria for inclusion regardless of gender, race, or ethnicity will be invited to participate. Participants must be student athletes at the participating institutions.

b) **Age range (check all that apply):**

- [ ] less than 1 year
- [XX] 18-65 years
- [ ] 1 – 5 years (Submit a parental consent form.)
- [ ] 65+ years
- [ ] 6 – 17 years (Submit a child’s assent form and parental consent form.)

c) **Will the “targeted” participant population be:** N/A

- [ ] people with developmental disabilities
- [ ] minors (under 18 years old)
- [ ] people with physical disabilities
- [ ] pregnant women
- [ ] people with psychiatric disabilities
- [ ] prisoners
- [ ] citizens from other countries
- [XX] Penn State students (2 of the 10 schools)
- [ ] members of a specific ethnic/cultural group
- [ ] students from the Psych. 2 subject pool
- [ ] fetus/fetal tissue
- [ ] hospitalized patients

d) **List criteria for inclusion of participants:**

Full time college student athletes at a participating AMCC college. The list of institutions below have agreed in principle to participate. After IRB approval, the athletic directors have been asked to put in writing their permission. Participating will be:

Hilbert College, Mediahle College, Mount Aloysius College, Lake Erie College, University of Pittsburgh at Bradford, University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg, Frostburg State University, LaRoche College, Penn State-Behrend, and Penn State Altoona.

e) **List criteria for exclusion of participants:**
Participants will not be recruited if their university has elected not to participate. Participants will be excluded if they are under 18.

10. **RECRUITMENT:**

   a) Describe how participants will be identified and recruited. Attach a copy of the recruitment materials (e.g., advertisement, invitation letter, invitation email, script) for review and approval.

   The Athletic Director of the college will be contacted and email notification will be sent requesting participation agreement. A copy of this email is attached.

   b) Who will make initial contact and how will it be made?

   Participation package and initial phone conversation with researcher will be made by phone.

   c) If individuals are excluded from participation based on information obtained through pre-screening, how will this information be reported back to them?

   n/a

   d) Will students, staff, or clients/patients of the investigator(s) be recruited to participate in this protocol?

   _____ Yes**  XX No

   **IF YES, please explain the measures that will be implemented to avoid coercion to participate.

   This will only occur by chance.

11. **CONSENT:** (Attach a copy of all proposed consent forms and assent forms to this application.)

   a) Describe how informed consent will be obtained.

   Since this is a web-based survey with the link provided in an email, the informed consent will be embedded in the first page of the web site. By reading the first page, each participant will have the ability to continue with the survey or to
discontinue. They will select the “start survey” button if they chose to participate. If they wish not to participate, they can either close their web program or typing in another web address.

The statement that appears on the first page of the survey is attached.

b) Who will be responsible for obtaining informed consent from the participants?

The investigator will obtain the consent by virtue of posting the implied consent for the participant to read.

c) Will participants be signing a consent form? _X_ (Interviewees) _Yes_ 
   _X_ (Students) _No_ **

**IF NO, answer the following questions.

i) Is a waiver of documentation of signed informed consent being requested? A waiver of documentation of signed informed consent would consist of implied consent, verbal consent, etc. Consent will still be obtained from participants; however, they would not be required to sign the consent form.

   _XX_ _Yes_ ** _No_ **If YES, you must be able to answer ‘Yes’ to one of the following statements.

   a. The only record linking the subject and the research is the consent document, and the principal risk is potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Participants are asked whether they want documentation linking them to the research, and their wishes will govern. _Yes_ ** _No_ **If YES, explain.

   The email ID of the respondent will be disaggregated from the response itself. The response will have a sequential identification number.
   The email addresses will be sent to a separate link to identify who has completed the survey. This information will only be used to randomly select prizes.

   b. The research involves no more than minimal risk and involves no procedure for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

   _XX_ _Yes_ ** _No_ **If YES, explain.
Students are simply completing an email survey.

ii) Is a waiver of informed consent being requested? In special and limited situations, research studies can apply to waive the informed consent process.

PLEASE NOTE: The IRB has the right to reject a request for a waiver of informed consent and require informed consent be obtained. Even if a waiver is granted, the IRB may require the researcher to provide participants with an information sheet (written summary) about the research.

___ Yes** ___XX__No **If YES, you must be able to answer ‘Yes‘ to ALL of the following statements.

a. The research in its entirety involves no greater than minimal risk.
   ___ Yes** ___XX__No **If YES, explain.

Students are simply completing an email survey.

b. The waiver of informed consent will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants.
   ___ Yes** ___XX__No **If YES, explain.

c. It is not practical to conduct the research without the waiver/alteration.
   _ ____ Yes** _ XX__No **If YES, explain.

d. Whenever, appropriate, participant will be provided with additional pertinent information after their participation.
   _ ____ Yes** _ XX____No **If YES, explain.

The researcher does not perceive a need to contact individual students after the survey is completed.

d) If participants are minors, have you prepared and attached a copy of both the parental and minor consent and the consent/assent forms for minors (6-
17 years) to this application? (See Guideline 1 on parental and minor assent: http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/hum/guide/I.html)

___ Yes _____ No ___XX___ N/A

e) If participants are institutionalized or have an appointed guardian, have you prepared and attached a copy of both the guardian/institutional and the participant consent/assent forms to this application? _____ Yes _____ No ___XX___ N/A

f) Participants are to receive a copy of the informed consent form. Describe how participants will receive a copy of the document for their records.

Participants will be able to read and agree to the informed consent form, prior to responding to the email survey. They will also be able to print the consent form for their records.

12. COMPENSATION:

a) Will compensation be offered to participants for their participation? ___XX____

Yes** _____ No

**If YES, answer the following questions. This information also needs to be included in the consent form.

i) What type(s) of compensation will be offered? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Extra/class credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___X Other (specify)</td>
<td>1 incentive per participating university not to exceed $25 + 10 prizes. In addition, one drawing of 100 dollars will be held for the entire population of respondents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) If extra/class credit is being offered as compensation, an alternative to participating in the research must be offered. Describe the alternatives available for earning the extra/class credit.

NA

iii) Describe how you will prevent or minimize coercion to participate.
Student participants will be given the option of not entering the drawing pool.

iv) Will compensation be pro-rated if a participant withdraws early from the project?
    ____ Yes**  ____ No  ____XX  N/A

**IF YES, describe how compensation will be pro-rated:

13. MATERIALS/EQUIPMENT: Describe all materials, questionnaires, interviews, surveys, and/or equipment to be used in this project. (Be sure to attach copies of all written materials to be used for this project.)

Error! Reference source not found. is attached for the informed consent for each Athletic Director.
Appendix H is attached for the survey to be given to the Athletic Director.

a) Will any type of recordings be made during this project?
    ____Yes**  ____XX  ____No

**If YES, answer the following questions. This information also needs to be included in the consent form.

i) What type of recordings will be made?  ____ audio  ____ video  ____ digital

ii) Where will the recordings be stored?

iii) Who will have access to the recordings?

iv) How will the recordings be transcribed and coded and by whom?

v) How and by what year will the recordings be destroyed?
14. **RISKS:** (NOTE: Risks can be physical, psychological, social, legal, etc. Risks may result from your experimental procedures or from your methods of obtaining, handling, or reporting data.)

   a) What are the potential risks to the participants? Describe all procedures that will cause any degree of discomfort, embarrassment, possible injury, stress, invasion of privacy, harassment, threat to the dignity of participants, or be otherwise potentially harmful to participants.

   There are no risks than the daily risk that comes from being on the internet.

   b) What is the likelihood and seriousness of these risks?

   NA

   c) Describe how you will minimize or protect participants throughout the project against potential risks.

   NA

15. **BENEFITS:**

   a) What are the potential benefits to the individual participants and/or society of the proposed research? (If none, state “None.”)

   The benefits of the proposed research are that institutions can be made aware of perceived inequities between genders at their institution. Institutions may choose to educate students on the measures being taken at their school.

   b) If applicable, explain how the benefits outweigh the risks.

   N/A

16. **REPORTING:**

   a) Is it possible that you will discover a participant’s previously unknown condition (e.g., disease, suicidal thoughts) as a result of study procedures? _____ Yes** _XX_ No

   **IF YES, explain *how and when* such a discovery will be handled.
b) Is it possible that you will discover a participant is engaging in illegal activities (e.g., drug use, domestic violence, child abuse/neglect, underage drinking)? _____ Yes**  XX____ No

**IF YES, explain *how and when* such a discovery will be handled.

17. DECEPTION:

NOTE ON DECEPTION: Federal officials, HHS, NIH, and OHRP have made public statements disapproving of any deception in research involving human participants. However, the Code of Federal Regulations, 45CFR46, allows some alteration in the elements of informed consent if: the research involves minimal risk; the rights and welfare of the participants are not compromised; the research cannot otherwise be conducted; and participants are provided with all pertinent information after participation. If full disclosure is impossible, it is recommended that the following statement be included on the consent form: "Because the validity of the results of the study could be affected if the purpose of the study is fully divulged to me prior to my participation, I understand that the purpose of the study cannot be explained to me at this time. I understand that I will have an opportunity to receive a complete explanation of the study's purpose following my participation in the study."

a) Does this project involve giving false or misleading information to participants or withholding information from them such that their “informed” consent is in question? _____Yes**  XX____ No

**IF YES, explain why the use of deception or withholding of complete information is required.

b) If deception is being used, is a copy of the debriefing/disclosure statement(s) enclosed with this application?

_____Yes  ____No

NA

18. CONFIDENTIALITY:

a) Describe provisions made to maintain confidentiality of data, including medical records.

All surveys are confidential. Raw data will only be available to the investigators listed on the project. The data will be kept in password protected computers.
Email addresses will be recorded on a separate link to identify who has completed the survey and who is eligible for the drawing. Email addresses cannot be tied to specific surveys.

b) Will data be associated with personal identifiers? _____ Yes**  XX _____ No
**If YES, who will have access to the personal identifiers?

c) Who will have access to the confidential data?
John Parente, Jr.

d) Where will data be kept and for how long?

The data will be stored in a University computer and kept for approximately 3 years. Data will only be used again if the researcher feels there are questions left unanswered.

e) What will happen to the data when the research has been completed? PLEASE NOTE: If personal identifiers will not be associated with the data (not including tapes), the data can be kept indefinitely.

No personal identifiers will be kept.

i) If personal identifiers are associated with the data, will the identifiers be stripped prior to archiving the data? _____ Yes _____ No**
**If NO, please explain why not.

f) Will a “Certificate of Confidentiality” be obtained from a Federal agency? _____ Yes  XX _____ No

g) Will data identifying the participants be made available to anyone other than the investigators (e.g., study sponsor)? _____ Yes**  XX _____ No  **IF YES, please explain:

19. HIPAA:
The federal regulation HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) contains a Privacy Rule that obligates health care providers, health plans, and health care clearinghouses to protect certain identifiable health information. For research purposes, the rule requires that access to protected health information (PHI) may require additional permission and documentation. HIPAA went into effect on April 14, 2003, and all research must be in compliance with the Privacy Rule by that date.

a. Are you obtaining research participant’s protected health information*(PHI) for this study in either electronic, faxed or hard copy form?  
   ____ YES**  ____XX  ____ NO

**If YES, HIPAA regulations apply. Please see the new consent requirements located at http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/HIPAA/cons_wording.rtf.

b. Does your study include protected health information collected from records of deceased research participants?  
   ____ YES**  ____XX  ____ NO

**If YES, HIPAA regulations apply. Please see the new consent requirements located at http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/HIPAA/forms/decends-info.rtf.

c. Describe the protected health information that will be obtained for this research project.

d. Investigators are required to only obtain the minimum necessary PHI in order to achieve the goals of the research. Explain why the PHI being obtained is the minimum necessary to achieve the goals of the research.

e. Personnel who will have access to the PHI must take the online training “HIPPA: The Impact on Research” - http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/HIPAA/training_instruct.htm. Who will have access to the PHI either during data collection or data analysis?

The Privacy Rule establishes Federal protections for the privacy of protected health information (PHI)*, which is defined as individually identifiable health information created or received by a covered entity. A covered entity may be a health care provider, a
health plan, or any covered component of Penn State that routinely bills for health care services AND electronically transmits identifiable information to another party to carry out financial or administrative activities related to health care. It is important to remember that not all personally identifiable health information is protected health information.
ASSURANCES FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

As the principal investigator on this project, I assure that...

1. this application, if funded by an extramural source, accurately reflects all procedures involving human participants described in the proposal to the funding agency previously noted.
2. I will obtain approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) before initiating any changes to the approved protocol, including changes in procedures, personnel, documents, instruments, etc.
3. I am familiar with and will comply with all pertinent institutional, local, state, and federal regulations and policies.
4. the information provided in this application reasonably summarizes the nature and extent of the proposed use of human participants.
5. I will notify the IRB within 5 weekdays regarding any significant adverse events that impact human participants.
6. all individuals involved with the research as described in this application are competent and have been properly trained. I also assure that all individuals will complete the required training for the protection of human participants available on-line prior to contact with human participants.
7. any individual associated with or responsible for the design, the conduct, or the reporting of this research will comply with Penn State Policy RA–05 regarding conflict of interest.

Signature of Principal Investigator, REQUIRED Date

PRINT Name of Faculty Advisor, REQUIRED IF PI IS A STUDENT

__________________________________________________________

SIGNATURE of Faculty Advisor, REQUIRED IF PI IS A STUDENT Date

I hereby confirm that I have read this application and my signature denotes departmental/unit approval of this project.

PRINT Name of Department/Unit Head, REQUIRED

__________________________________________________________

SIGNATURE of Department/Unit Head, REQUIRED Date
Appendix C

Initial Letter to Athletic Directors

Dear Athletic Director,

I would first like to take a minute to re-introduce myself. My name is John Parente and I am a graduate student at Penn State University. In addition, I coach the Men's Soccer team at Penn State Altoona. During the Summer of 2004, Dr. Cale (former CEO of Penn State Altoona) and Donna Ledwin, AMCC Commissioner, presented my possible study on Title IX to the college Presidents and Athletic Directors of the Conference. The study was approved and my proposal defense was set into motion.

My committee and I changed the scope of the study slightly. They believed the study was not about Title IX, but more about gender equity. The Title IX expert on the committee did not see the difference, and I don't think I did either. However, at the very least it appears to be a case of semantics. In any event, all official documents will state that it is a gender equity study.

The study will consist of two phases: One step is to have an interview or discussion with each athletic director to get an idea of what athletics are like at their institution. At this time, there are no serious time requirements for when I complete this interview. I will be in touch to arrange a time convenient for the both of us. The other phase will be a 5-10 minute online survey available to all student athletes at each of the ten AMCC institutions. Incentives will be given for athletes completing the survey. For each institution that submits over 50 participants, an individual (chosen at random specifically from that institution) will win a $25 gift card (Amazon.com). A grand prize drawing will be held from all participants for a $100 gift card (Amazon.com). An introduction and weblink to the survey will be sent to student email accounts. My goal is to have the students complete this phase before they leave for summer break.

In addition, Penn State University's Office for Research Protections has requested that I obtain written approval from each athletic director on the participation of their institution to fulfill the human subjects’ requirement for my research. If additional Institutional Research Board approval is required at your college, please let me know.

I would greatly appreciate if you could respond to this email and give your permission to conduct the gender equity study at your institution. In addition, I will need a list of email addresses for all student athletes at your institutions. These email addresses will be used for the sole purpose of this research study. If you would prefer to send the email through your own account, please contact me to discuss how this will work.
Following your approval to conduct this study and receipt of the email address, I will enter the email addresses into an on-line survey instrument. Each student will then receive an email from me describing the survey and asking for their participation. When a student clicks on the link from their email account, the on-line survey instrument is able to identify who has completed the survey, which makes distribution of prizes possible. Towards the end of the semester, I will contact you directly to set up a convenient time for a phone interview.

Thank you in advance for your time and I look forward to working with you on this project.

John
Appendix D
Solicitation of Subjects

We would like to invite you to participate in a dissertation study at Penn State University, we are asking you to take a few minutes to answer some questions on student perceptions of gender equity within college athletics on your campus. (IRB#20830). Any student athlete is eligible to participate.

Your institution has agreed to be a participant and is assisting in the distribution of the email and link to the survey. As an incentive, upon completion of the survey, you will be given the opportunity to provide your email address solely for the purpose of the drawing. One person from each college or university will be selected for a $25 gift certificate from Amazon.com. In addition, one person at large will be selected for a $100 gift certificate from Amazon.com. Your participation is entirely voluntary and your individual responses will be held in strictest confidence.

If you are willing to participate, please visit http://www.zoomerang.com/survey.zgi?p=XXXXXXXX

and fill out a brief survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the John Parente at jmp296@psu.edu or at (814) 949-5735. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact Penn State’s Office for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775.

Thank you for your help.

John Parente
Penn State Altoona
Appendix E

Web Site Greeting & Informed Consent for Subjects

Greeting on the Web site for the survey

This study (IRB#20830) seeks to obtain information on the perceptions that student athletes (both male and females) have concerning gender equity in all the intercollegiate sports programs at their institutions. The study is being done as a doctoral dissertation project at the School of Education of Penn State University. The Office for Research Protections may review records related to this project.

Please help by completing the following survey. Your participation is important if the findings of the study are to accurately reflect the views of student athletes. It should take 5-10 minutes to complete. While the results of the survey will be shared with the participating institutions, reports will be in the form of statistical summaries, and no identification of individual respondents will be possible. Your answers will be treated confidentially, and your name will never be linked with your answers.

Your participation is voluntary, and you have the right to refuse to answer any specific questions or to terminate your participation at any time. However, your responses will be most useful if you complete every question. There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. The results will benefit research geared towards understanding how college student athletes perceive gender equity.

As a thank you for your participation, after you complete the survey your email address will automatically be registered for a chance to receive Amazon.com gift cards for values between $25 and $100. Your email addresses will only be kept for the drawings. They will not be linked with the surveys and will be destroyed within two months at the end of the data collection.

Your confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Specifically, no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in the study.

If you have questions about my rights as a research participant, you can contact the Office for Research Protections at 814-865-1775. If you have any questions about the project, or would like additional information about the study or your participation in it, feel free to contact:

John Parente
814-949-5735
By selecting to start the survey you are agreeing to participate and giving your consent. If you do not wish to give your consent, and would like not to participate, please close your web program or type in another web address. You may print a copy of the consent form to keep for your records.

This informed consent form was reviewed and approved by the Office for Research Protections at The Pennsylvania State University on (4/11/2005). It will expire on (4/4/2009).
Appendix F
Final Survey for Student Athletes

Student Athlete Survey

1. Which of the following institutions do you currently attend?
   - Hilbert College
   - Frostburg State University
   - Lake Erie College
   - LaRoche College
   - Medaille College
   - Mount Aloyius College
   - Penn State Altoona
   - Penn State Behrend
   - University of Pittsburgh at Bradford
   - University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg

2. During the four years of high school, in how many Varsity Sports did you participate?
   - None
   - One
   - Two
3. To how many colleges or universities did you apply?

4. Did you complete the NCAA Clearinghouse forms?
   - I have no idea what those are
   - No, I did not
   - Yes, I did

5. How many colleges and/or universities recruited you to compete in any sport at their institution?

6. Which intercollegiate sports have you ever competed in at your institution? Check all that apply.
   - Cross Country
Apart from athletic activities required for your participation in your intercollegiate sport(s), how involved are you in OTHER athletic activities on campus (e.g. intramurals, recreational sports, weight room, jogging, etc)?

1=Not at all involved
2=Involved very little
3=Somewhat involved
4=Pretty involved
5=Very involved

Excluding ALL athletic activities, how involved are you in OTHER campus clubs and organizations?

1=Not at all involved
2=Involved very little
For the following areas, please rate on the scale what you feel to be true at your institution?

1 = women are definitely treated better than men
2 = women are treated slightly better than men
3 = Men and women are treated the same
4 = men are treated slightly better than women
5 = men are definitely treated better than women

---

**Athletic scholarships**

1 2 3 4 5

**Athletes equipment and supplies**

1 2 3 4 5

**The level of professional training for coaches**

1 2 3 4 5

**Times of games and practices**
For the following areas, please rate on the scale what you feel to be true at your institution?

1=women are definitely treated better than men
2=women are treated slightly better than men
3=Men and women are treated the same
4=men are treated slightly better than women
5=men are definitely treated better than women

1. Locker Rooms, practice facilities, & game fields
2. Dining facilities and/or living arrangements
3. Medical & training staff
4. Tutors and or academic assistance
5. Money and food provided for away trips
1=women are definitely treated better than men
2=women are treated slightly better than men
3=Men and women are treated the same
4=men are treated slightly better than women
5=men are definitely treated better than women"

Publicity of individuals and teams

Other support services given to athletics

Providing equal accommodations of the interests and abilities of both genders

Recruitment of future athletes

12
What is your current college/university Grade Point Average?

13
Including the current semester, how many semesters have you been at your current institution?
14

Gender

- Female
- Male

15

Race/Ethnicity

- African American/ Black
- American Indian/ Native American
- Asian American/ Pacific Islander
- Latino/ Hispanic
- White/ Caucasian
- Other

16

Mother's education (highest level achieved)

- Some High School
- High School
- Some College
- Associate Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Some Graduate school
17

Father's education (highest level achieved)

- Some High School
- High School
- Some College
- Associate Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Some Graduate school
- Master's Degree or Advanced Certificate
- Doctorate or Law Degree
- Other, Please Specify

18

Which of the following statements best describes your family's income?

- My family income is less than most other students I know
- My family income is about the same as other students I know
- My family income is more than other students I know
Please enter your school email address to be eligible for the drawing at the completion of this survey.
Appendix G

Athletic Director Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of project: Perceptions of Gender Equity among Student Athletes (IRB 20830)

Investigators: John M Parente, Assistant to the Director of Student Affairs
Penn State Altoona
3000 Ivyside Drive, Altoona, PA 16601
(814)949-5735; jmp296@psu.edu

Advisor: Robert Hendrickson

241 Chambers Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-1489; rmh6@psu.edu

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to assess the perceptions of gender equity within the student-athlete population of the Alleghany Mountain Athletic Association. We hope to be able to address aspects of the implementation that may be improved at particular campuses. Qualitative interviews with athletic directors will help illustrate what each institution is doing to ensure gender equity.

Procedures: If you agree to take part in this research, you will be asked a series of questions in a phone interview aimed to provoke a conversation about the state of affairs of athletics and gender equity at your institution.

Discomfort or risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

Benefits: This research may provide a better understanding of how college student athletes perceive gender equity and its implications on Title IX education at colleges and universities.

Duration: Your participation in this research will take somewhere between 20 and 30 minutes.

Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. While the researcher will be able to identify your statements with your institution, we are simply looking for a description of the institution to help with the analysis of the students. In the event of publication of this research, no personally or institutionally identifying information will be disclosed. The Office for Research Protections may review records related to this project.

Right to ask questions: You may ask questions about the research. Contact John Parente with questions at 814-949-5735. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact Penn State’s Office for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775.
Voluntary Participation: Your participation is voluntary. You are free to stop participating in the research at any time, or to decline to answer any specific questions without penalty.

Return of Form: You may fax the signed form back to me at 814-949-5805.

I understand the above consent form and wish to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Title: _____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature: _____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher: ______________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORP USE ONLY:
The Pennsylvania State University
Office for Research Protections
Approval Date: ________________
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Appendix H

Athletic Director Structured Interview

Mr./Ms. ________, thank you for taking this time with me today. As you know, we
have already conducted a survey of close to 600 student athletes from the
AMCC. The intention of the study is to identify the student athlete perceptions of
gender equity within the conference. My intention with you here today is to get some
background information about the school and the athletic department.

1. How long have you been athletic director at __________?

2. Can you tell me the total number of Athletics teams you have on campus?

3. Can you tell me the total number of student athletes you have participating on
these teams? Male and females?

4. What is the total enrollment at __________ college?

5. Can you give me an estimate of the overall operating budget of the campus?

6. Can you give me an estimate of the operating budget for athletics?

7. What formal and informal programs/measure/activities do you (as an institution)
do to ensure gender equity among your athletes?
8. Your student athletes were asked a series of questions that asked them to identify if they felt men or women were treated better at your campus. How do you think your student athletes responded to that question?

9. Has any of your staff brought perceived inequities of male or female athletes at your campus? Can you give me an examples and how you handled their concerns.

10. Do you feel that in your time as AD that you have made any significant gains in gender equity at your campus?
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